

bandhāt, by the relation to the owner, एव eva, solely ; निमित्तद्वा nimittād, by reason, अन्यस्य anyasya, of another, स्वम् svam, property, भवति bhavati, becomes ; तद् tad that, उच्यते uchyate, is called, is named, is signified

2. Here the term heritage (dāya) signifies that wealth, which becomes the property of another, solely by reason of relation to the owner.

एव द्विविधः । अप्रतिबन्धः सप्रतिबन्धश्च । तत्र पुत्राणां वीत्राणां च पुत्रत्वेन वीत्रत्वेन च पितृधनं पितामहधनं च स्वम् भवतीत्यप्रतिबन्धोदाहृतः । पितृव्यसत्त्वादात्मांस्तु पुत्राभावे स्वाग्न्यभावे च स्वम् भवतीति पुत्रसद्भावे. स्वामिसत्त्वाव्यप्रतिबन्धस्तदभावे पितृव्यत्वेन भ्रातृत्वेन च स्वम् भवतीति सप्रतिबन्धोदाहृतः । एवं कर्तृप्रादिष्वप्युद्गीर्णः ।

स sah, it, च cha, and, द्विविधं dvī vidhah, of two sorts, अप्रतिबन्धः apratibandha, unobstructed, सप्रतिबन्धः sapratibandha, liable to obstruction, च cha, and, तत्र tatra, there, पुत्राणाम् putrāṇām, of sons, वीत्राणाम् putrāṇām, of grandsons, च cha, and, पुत्रत्वेन putratvena, by virtue of being sons, वीत्रत्वेन putratvena, by right of being grandsons, च cha, and, पितृ धनम् pitrī dhanam, the wealth of the grandfather ; पितामह-धनम् pitā-maha dhanām, the wealth of the grandfather ; च cha, and, स्वम् svam, one's own property भवति bhavati, 'becomes', इति iti, so, अप्रतिबन्धः apratibandhah, not liable to obstruction, दायं dayam, heritage, मिदृग्य-भ्रातादीनाम् pitrīvyā bhātrīyādīnām, of uncles and brothers and the rest, तु tu, hut, पुत्राभावे utra'abhavo, in the absence of male issue, स्वाग्न्यभावे svāgnyābhāve, in the absence of the owner, च cha, and, स्वम् svam, property, भवति bhavati, becomes इति iti, thus, पुत्रसद्भावे putra sād-bhāvah, the actual (सत्) existence (भाव) of a son (पुत्र), स्वामिसद्भावे svāmi sād-bhāvah, the actual existence or survival of the owner, च cha, and, प्रतिबन्धः pratibandhah, impediment, तदभावे tad abhāve, on their ceasing, पितृव्यत्वेन pitrīvyatvena, in right of being uncle, भ्रातृत्वेन bhātrītyena, in right of being a brother, च cha, and, स्वम् svam, property (his own), भवति bhavati, becomes, इति iti, thus, सप्रतिबन्धः sapratibandhah, liable to obstruction, subject to obstruction, दायं dayam, heritage, एवम् evam, thus, तदुत्रादिषु tat, utra-ādīṣu, in respect of their sons and other (descendants), अपि api, also, उद्गीर्णः ūghīrṇyah, is to be reasoned or to be inferred, to be taken as holding good

3. It is of two sorts unobstructed (apratibandha) or liable to obstruction (sapratibandha) The wealth of the father or of the paternal grandfather, becomes the property of his sons or of his grandsons in right of their being his sons or grandsons :

and that is an inheritance not liable to obstruction. But property devolves on parents (or uncles) brothers and the rest, upon the demise of the owner, if there be no male issue, and thus the actual existence of a son and the survival of the owner are impediments to the succession, and, on their ceasing, the property devolves on the successor in the right of his being uncle or brother. This is an inheritance subject to obstruction. The same holds good in respect of their sons and other (descendants)

Balambhatta's Gloss

2, 3—He explains the term 'heritage' 'Heré' means while dealing with the 'partition of heritage'. It excludes the popular idea of acquisition by sale &c, 'Relation' means the connection of the progeny with the proprietor &c, of the sons with the owner of the property &c. That the word 'heritage' is conventionally used when the property of the former owner on the cessation of his ownership passes to another, as said previously, is refuted; because it contravenes the text 'if partition is effected' (II 114) which presupposes the ownership with birth. This kind of heritage is called 'unobstructed', it is a *Vakubrahm* compound. He explained the first kind, 'tatra' means 'of the two'. Under text 'the land of the grand father . . . (II 121) the grandsons have equal rights in the property with their father by reason of their birth without any other means of acquisition it is unobstructed heritage.

He proceeds to describe the second kind of heritage which is liable to obstruction. 'Of the uncle and brother and the rest' in the text means the uncle, brother and others. Out of honour he is mentioned first, the uncle being entitled to the property is described already. Here the object in mentioning uncle is by way of illustration but not to indicate 'order'. There is another reading 'father and brother &c', this indicates the order and means parents and brother &c.

'Upon the demise of the owner if there be no male issue' contemplates the absence of both (the *prepositus* and the lineal descendants). 'In respect of their sons and other' means the sons &c of the uncle &c, because when these who are entitled to the property of the deceased by reason of the unobstructed line come under the first category and those who are obstructed (by the presence of such lineal descendants) come under the second category.

विभागो नाम द्रव्यसमुदायविषयाणामनन्स्वाम्यानां तदेकदेशेषु द्रव्यस्य व्यवस्थापनम् ।

विभागो नाम *Vibhāgaḥ-nāma*, partition is (means) द्रव्य-समुदाय विषयाणाम् *dravya samudāya viṣayanām*, of the objects of the whole of the wealth, अनेक दशायासाम् *aneka dśāyāsam*, of diverse rights तदेकदेशेषु *tad-ekadeśeṣu* on particular portions of the aggregate, द्रव्यस्य *dravyasya*, of the (whole)

wealth ; व्यवस्थापनम् vyaasthāpanam, adjustment.

4. Partitions (vibhāga) is the adjustment of divers rights regarding the whole, by distributing them on particular portions of the aggregate.

Balambhatta's Gloss.

4. Having explained the meaning of the term 'heritage', he explains the meaning of the term 'partition'. The separate allotment of the shares in the joint property of those who are not divided as of sons who have equal ownership therein is denoted by the term 'partition'.

एतदेवामिप्रेत्येकं नारदेन ॥ विभागोऽर्थस्य पित्र्यस्य तनयैर्न कल्प्यते । दाय-
भाग इति प्रोक्तं व्यवहारपदं बुधैरिति । पित्र्यस्येति स्वत्यनिमित्तसंबन्धोपलक्षणम् ।
तनयैरित्यपि प्रत्यासन्नोपलक्षणम् ।

एतद् Etad this, एव eva, very, the same opinion ; अमिप्रेत्य abhipretya, meaning, intending, referring, supporting ; उक्तम् uktam, it is said ; नारदेन nārdeṇa, by Nārada ; विभागः vibhāgaḥ, division ; अर्थस्य arthasya, of the estate ; पित्र्यस्य pitryasya, of the paternal ; तनयैः tanayaib, by the sons ; यत्र yatra, where ; कल्प्यते kalpyate, is instituted ; दाय भागः dāya-bhāgaḥ, partition of heritage ; इति iti, as ; प्रोक्तम् proktam, called ; व्यवहार-पदम् vyavahāra-padam, topic of litigation ; बुधैः budhaiḥ, by the wise ; इति iti, so, thus ; पित्र्यस्य pitryasya, "of the paternal" ; इति iti, means ; स्वत्य avatya, of property ; निमित्त nimitta, the cause (which is) ; संबन्धोपलक्षणम् sambandha-upalakṣaṇam, something that implies the relation ; तनयैः tanyaiḥ, 'by sons' ; इति iti, this ; अपि api, too ; प्रत्यासन्नोपलक्षणम् pratyāsanna-upalakṣaṇam, (a) something that implies propinquity.

5. Entertaining the same opinion, Nārada says, "Where a division of the paternal estate is instituted by sons, that becomes a topic of litigation called by the wise partition of heritage". "Paternal" here implies any relation, which is a cause of property. "By sons" indicates propinquity in general.

Balambhatta's Gloss.

5 He supports the above view from a quotation from Nārada. *Pitryasya* (paternal) is formed by adding 'an' according to the rule enunciated by Paṇini ('His it.' IV 3 120. See for further explanation Paṇini's Grammar of the Pāṇini Office, at page 792) ; while 'pitryasya' which is the reading of Kalpataru is not correct, because it is read in connection with the rights of the deities. *Yatra* in the text of Nārada means 'in litigation'. There is another reading 'तद्विवादपदबुधैः' (topic of dispute) ; here *sat* qualifies the thing described.

In order to avoid the defect, he explains one's said wealth passing to another 'Paternal' in the text which means the relation with the owner by virtue of which ownership in the property arises is by way of illustration. It includes the property of the grandfather also. He therefore says 'sons', 'propinquity' means unobstructed relation. He previously said division of the undivided land, gold etc., in which there is a right by birth, in the absence of the conclusive proof of title by reason of their being incapable of special mode of transfer by casting lots is set aside. By reason of the general nature of the relationship causing the ownership and by reason of the absence of the conclusive proof of title in keeping the property intact, it is very difficult to say otherwise than also, there will be freedom of action and mutual hostility.

इदमिह निरूपणीयम् । कस्मिन्काले कस्य कथं कैश्च विभागः कर्तव्य इति । तत्र कस्मिन्काले कथं कैश्चेति तत्र तत्र श्लोकाव्याख्यानरथं वक्ष्यते । कस्यविभाग इत्येतावदिह चिन्त्यते ।

इदम् idam this these points इह (ha, here, under this head), निरूपणीयम् nirūpanīyam, to be explained कस्मिन् kasmīn at what, काले kālē, (at) time, कस्य kasya, of what, कथम् katham how, कै कैश्च kaih, by whom च cha, and, विभाग vibhāgaḥ, a partition, कर्तव्यः kartavyaḥ, is to be made, इति iti, so, thus, then, now तत्र tatra, there, कस्मिन् kasmīn, at what, काले kālē, time, कथम् katham, how, कै कैश्च kaih, by whom, च cha, and, इति iti, all these, तत्र तत्र tatra tatra, in those various places, and respectively, श्लोक व्याख्यानं śloka vyākhyāna, in the course of interpreting stanzas, एव eva, very, indeed, वक्ष्यते vakṣyate, will be explained, कस्य kasya, of what, विभाग vibhāgaḥ, the partition इति iti, thus, एतावत् etiāvad, this much so much, इह (ha, here), चिन्त्यते chintyate, is considered

6 The points to be explained under this (head of inheritance) are, at what time, how, and by whom, a partition is to be made, of what. The time, the manner, and the persons, when, in which, and by whom it may be made, will be explained in the course of interpreting stanzas on those subjects respectively. What that is, of which a partition takes place is here considered.

किं विभागास्वात्पुनः स्वस्य शरीरविभागा इति । तत्स्वत्वमेव तावद्विद्व्यते । किं शरीरसमधिगम्य स्वात्पुनः प्रमाणान्तरसमधिगम्यमिति ।

किम् kīm what, whether, it (to be taken as showing the interrogative form) विभागम् vibhāgam, from ; partition, स्वात्वात् स्वात्वान्, ; property एव uta or, स्वस्य avasya of ; property, ततः satat which is ; re-existent विभाग vibhāgaḥ property, इति iti, so, thus, तत्र tatra, under this, स्वात्वात् स्वात्वान्, proprietary right, एव eva, the same, itself, तावत् tatvad, wholly, necessari-

ly ; निरूप्यते nirūpyate, is explained ; किम् kim, whether ; शास्त्रेकं śāstra-eka, from the sacred institutes alone ; समधिगम्यम् samadhigamyam, is to be deduced , स्वत्वम् svalvam, property , इतः uta, or , प्रमाणान्तरं pramaṇa-antara, from other proof ; समधिगम्यम् samadhigamyam, to be deduced ; इति itī, such (is the question).

7. Does property arise from partition ? or does partition of pre-existent property take place ? Under this (head of discussion) proprietary right is itself necessarily explained : (and the question is) : Whether property be deduced from the sacred institutes alone, or from other (and temporal) proof.

Balambhatta's Gloss.

8 & 7 Having explained the relevancy, in order to make a determination and to come to the subject of partition, at the outset he says 'idam' (this), 'iha' (here) means 'under this subject of partition'. Here 'kasya' (whose) points to the property ; 'katham' (how) means 'the mode' and 'kaishcha' (by whom) means the agents, the actors, 'Tatra' (there) means 'amongst the four', 'iha' (here) means 'first' because of its being the original cause and useful in the subject of heritage.

There is twofold determination ; the first point to be determined is the property to be partitioned. The question is, does partition create a title in one who has no property ? because by partition there is separate property but not before it ; or does birth alone create a title but not partition ? because thereby arises in one a right to get the property partitioned. This is therefore one point. He says 'does property arise from partition ?' 'Swam' (property) means 'one's own' ; 'swasya' (of the property) 'of one's own pre-existing' ; 'tatra' (there) means in the above said determination ; 'eva' (only) indicates the impossibility without the determination thereof. That it is so, will be manifest later on ; here in this determination there is the topic of the property. Then he puts a question 'whether...from the sacred institutes alone' ; it means 'that alone' ; 'from other proof' means 'temporal'.

तत्रशब्देन समधिगम्यमिति तावद्युक्तं गौतमवचनात् (१०-३६-४१) । स्वामी रिक्यकवसंसिभागवत्सिद्धान्तिमेषु ब्राह्मणस्याधिकं सम्यं कथितस्य विज्ञानं निर्दिष्टं विश्वग्रहयोरिति । प्रमाणान्तरगम्ये स्वत्येनेह यच्चनमर्यवत्स्यात् । तथा स्तेनादिदेशे मनुः । (अ० = अलो० १५०) योऽदत्तादायिनो हस्तलिप्तेन ब्राह्मणोपधनम् । याजना-ध्यापनाद्विषया स्तेनस्तथैव खरति । अदत्तादायिनः सक्त्यात् याजनादिद्वारेण द्रव्यमर्जयतां दण्डविधानमुपपन्नं स्वात्स्वत्वस्य लौकिकत्वे । अपि च । लौकिकं ये स्वत्य मम स्वमनेनापह्नमिति न श्रूयते । अपहर्तृण्ये स्वत्वात् । अन्यथा स्वं तेनाप-हृतमिति नापह्नः स्यात् । एव तद्धि सुवर्णरजतादिस्वरूपवदस्य वा स्वमन्यस्य वा स्वमिति संशयान्न स्यात् । तस्माच्छब्दान् समधिगम्यं स्वत्वमिति ॥

तत्र Tatra, in that case , शास्त्रेक Śāstra eka, from the sacred code alone , समधिगम्यम् samadhigamyam, is to be deduced (the property) ; इति iti, so , तावद् tāvad, indeed , युक्तम् yuktam, right , गौतम-वचनात् Gautama-
vachanāt, 'on account of the text of Gautama , स्वामी svāmi, an owner ,
रिष्य rikṣa, by inheritance , क्रय kraya, purchase , सविभाग samavibhaga,
partition , परिग्रह parigraha, seizure , अधिगमेषु adhigameṣu, or by finding
य ब्राह्मण्य brāhmaṇasya, for a Brahmana , अधिकम् adhikam, an additional
mode , लब्धम् labdham, acceptance , क्षत्रियस्य kṣatriyasya, for a kṣatriya ,
विजितम् vijitam, conquest , निर्वहम् nirvṛtam, gain ; वैश्य शूद्रयो vaiśya-
śūdrayoh, for a vaiśya and śūdra इति iti, so, thus , प्रमाणान्तरगम्ये prama-
na antara gamye, if to be deducible from other proofs , स्वदे svatre,
property , न na, not , इदम् idam, this , वचनम् vachanam, text ; वा वा ,
arthavat, pertinent , स्यात् syāt, would be (न स्यात् would not be) , तथा tatha,
so , स्तेनातिदेशे stena-atideshe, in the extended applications of the term
"thief" , मनुः Manuḥ, says Manu , यः yaḥ, who , अदत्तादायिनः adatta ādayi-
nah, of a person who had taken what was not given to him , हस्त लब्धतः haastāt, from
the hand , लिप्तेव lipset, seeks to obtain ब्राह्मण्य brahmanah a Brahmana ,
धनम् dhanam, wealth , याजनं yājana, by sacrificing , अध्यापनाद् adhyāpanād,
by instructing , वा वा, or , अपि api, even , यथा yatha, as , स्तेनः stenaḥ, a
thief , तथा tathā, so , एव eva, , rectely , स. saḥ, he (is) , इति iti, so (gives
the precept of Manu about a thief) , अदत्तादायिनः adattādayinah, one who
has taken what was not given to him , सकाशात् sakāśāt, from , 'याजनादिद्वारेण
yājanādi-dvāreṇa, by officiating at sacrifices and other religious rites
or by other means , द्रव्यम् dravyam, valuable things , अर्जयताम् arjayatām,
of those who obtain , दण्डविधानम् danda vidhānam, text that lays down
punishment , उपपन्नम् upajannam, fair, proper , स्यात् syāt, would be , स्वतस्य
svatasya, of property , लौकिकत्वे laukikatve, in the temporallness , अपि च
api cha, and moreover , लौकिकम् laukikam, by temporal, a worldly mat-
ter , चेत् chet, if , स्वतस्य svatvam, property , मम mama my , स्वम् svam pro-
perty , अनेन anena, by him , अपहृतम् apahritam, has been wrongfully taken,
इति iti, so, thus , न na, not , ब्रूयत् brūyāt, could say , अपहृतुं apahartuḥ, of
the taker , एव eva, indeed, very , स्वत्वाद् svatvāt, because it would become
the property (of the taker) , अन्यथा anyathā, or स्वम् svam, the property ,
तेन tena, by him , अपहृतम् apahritam was seized इति iti, so, therefore , न
na, not अपहृतुं apahartuḥ of the taker, or स्वम् svam property , एवम् evam ,
thus , तर्हि tathā, then सुवर्ण रजतदिव्यरूपेण ह सुवर्ण रजतानादीनामुपपन्नः
just as in the case of species whether gold silver or the like , अन्यथा any-
था वा वा or , स्वम् svam, property , अन्यस्य anyasya, of the other वा
vā, or , स्वम् svam, property , इति iti, so संतर्कः samānyah doubt
न na, no , स्यात् syāt, there should be , तस्मात् tasmāt, therefore , शास्त्रेकम्

ययम् śastra-eka samadhi-gamyam, to be deduced from holy institutes alone, स्वयम् svatvam, property, इति iti, so, thus

8 (It is alleged, that) the inferring of property from the sacred code alone is right, on account of the text of Gautama, "An owner is by inheritance, purchase, partition, seizure, or finding. Acceptance is for a Brahmana an additional mode, conquest for a Cshatriya, gain for a Vaisya, or Sudra". For, if property were deducible from other proof, this text would not be pertinent. So the precept ("A Bramana, who seeks to obtain anything, even by sacrificing or by instructing from the hand of a man, who had taken what was not given to him, is considered precisely as a thief;) which directs the punishment of such as obtain valuables, by officiating at religious rites, or by other similar means, from a wrongdoer who has taken what was not given to him, would be irrelevant if property were temporal. Moreover, were property a worldly matter, one could not say, "My property has been wrongtully taken by him" for it would belong to the taker. Or, (if it be objected that) the property of another was seized by this man, and it therefore does not become the property of the usurper, (the answer is) then no doubt could exist, whether it appertain to one or to the other, any more than in regard to the species, whether gold, silver or the like. Therefore property is a result of holy institutes exclusively.

Balambhatta's Gloss

8 He proceeds to explain the first view, 'tatra' means 'of these two' He explains the same, 'owner' has been explained already, it will be clear at every step in the original. He explains the source of its acquisition, 'other proof' means temporal. This is Gautama's text. There is no use in repetition, he shows the contradiction with another text 'So' (tatha) 'if property were temporal' should be connected with what follows; 'from a wrong doer who has taken what was not given to him' is in the genitive case and means connected with the hand taking the property from the hand of a thief who has acquired the property of another who has not given it. Subsequently, he explains the result, 'Yajana' (officiating at religious rites) is a *daanda* compound 'api' (even) means 'the different modes of acquisition'. Comparison with theft is with a view to inflict punishment.

He gives a reason in support of the property being non temporal. 'Moreover', 'property' 'that' is understood, he gives a reason, 'it would belong to the taker' because we see it in his possession. In order

to avoid this difficulty, he raises a special doubt 'Atha', he proceeds to remove it, 'similarly then' (evam tarhi) on the property being temporal and on its being seized upon by another, if the owner complains, 'my property has been taken away by him' there arises a such doubt in the mind of the hearing members of the assembly (judges of the court or the jury) Just as in the worldly affair on examining gold or silver, there is no doubt left whether it is gold etc or not, similarly there will be none in the case of the property By reason of the existence of the millions of credentials from the people, a doubt, however, arises and it can not be said 'the property, therefore, does not belong to the seizer' Or in the alternative, the complainant (or the plaintiff) should be asked 'there is no conviction (certainty) that the property does not belong to the usurper' 'Similarly then' just as on the conviction arising that it is gold or silver, there is no doubt left as to gold etc, so it is in the present case, but not so in the second case, because it can not be said that the property does not belong to the usurper, on conviction not arising In this way he sums up, 'therefore.'

अमोच्यते । लौकिकमेव स्वत्व लौकिकार्थक्रियासाधनत्वात् । ग्रीष्मादिवत् ।
आहवनीयादीनां हि शास्त्रगम्यानां न लौकिकक्रियासाधनत्वमस्ति । नन्याहवनीयादी-
नामपि पाकादिसाधनत्वमस्त्येव । नैतत् । न हि तयाहवनीयादिरूपेण पाकादिसाधन-
त्वम् । किं तर्हि प्रत्यक्षादिपरदृश्यमानाग्न्यादिरूपेण । इह तु सुवर्णादिरूपेण न कषादि-
साधनत्वमपि तु स्वत्वेनैव । न हि यस्य यत्स्व न भवति तत्तद्वत् क्रयाचर्षक्रियां
साधयति । अपिच । प्रत्यन्तवासिनाभ्यमदृश्यात्मव्यवहाराणां स्वत्व-व्यवहारोदृश्यते ।
क्रयाविकषादिवर्तनात् ।

अत्र atra, here to this ; उच्यते uchyate, it is said as an objection ,
लौकिकम् laukikam, temporal ; एव eva, only , स्वत्वम् svatvam, property (is) ,
लौकिकार्थक्रियासाधनत्वात् laukikārtha kriyā sādhanatvāt, for it effects tra-
sactions relative to worldly purposes , ग्रीष्मादिवत् griṣmādivat, just as in the
case of rice and similar substances , आहवनीयादीनाम् Ahavanīyālinām, as
regards the consecrated fire (आहवनीय) and the like substances हि hi, but ,
शास्त्रगम्यानाम् śāstra gamyānām, deducible from holy institutes ; न na, not ,
लौकिकम् laukika, secular, क्रिया kriyā, purposes ; साधनत्वम् sādhanatvam the virtue
of effecting (secular purposes) , अस्ति asti, there is (na not) , ननु nanu, is it
not indeed that ; आहवनीयानाम् Ahavanīyānām, of the consecrated fire &c ;
पाकादिसाधनत्वम् pākādisādhana-tvam, the virtue of effecting cooking etc ,
अस्ति asti, there is , एव eva, indeed, surely , न na, no , एतत् etat, this (is
not so) , न na, not (it is not) , हि hi, because , अत्र tatra, there , आहवनीयादि-
रूपेण Ahavanīyādirūpeṇa by its nature of being the consecrated fire ,
पाकादिसाधनत्वम् pākādisādhana-tvam the power of effecting cooking etc ,
किं तर्हि kintarhi, but as ; प्रत्यक्षादि pratyakṣādi, to the senses (such as sight
etc) , परिदृश्यमानं paridṛśyamāna perceptible , अग्न्यादिरूपेण agni-ādi rūpeṇa,

but as in the form of fire etc ; इह iha, here ; तु tu, but ; सुवर्णदिहयेय anvar-
ṇādi-rūpeṇ, through the form of gold etc ; न na, not ; क्रयादि krayādi, the
purchase etc., साधनत्वम् sādhanatvam, the virtue of being the means of
effecting ; अपि api, indeed ; तु tu, but ; स्वत्वेन स्वात्वेन, by virtue of its
being property , एव eva, only , न na, not , हि hi, because , यस्य yasya,
whose, of a person ; यत् yat, which ; स्वम् svam, property ; न na, not ;
भवति bhavati, becomes , तत् tat, that ; तस्य tasya, his ; क्रयादि kraya-ādi, by
sale &c. ; अर्थ-क्रियाम् artha-kriyām, transfer of a thing ; साधयति sādhyati,
does not give effect , अपि च api-cha, even and ; मलम्बवासिनाम् pratyasanta-
vāsinām, of the inhabitants of the barbarous countries ; अपि api, even ;
अदृष्टशास्त्रव्यवहारिणाम् adṛṣṭaśāstravyavahārīṇām, who are unacquainted
with the practices in the sacred code ; स्वत्वव्यवहारः स्वात्वाव्यवहारः,
use of the property , दृश्यते dṛśyate, is seen ; क्रय-विक्रयादि-दर्शनात् kraya-
vikraya ādi-darśanāt, by seeing purchase-sale &c.

9. To this the answer is, property is temporal only, for it
effects transactions relative to worldly purposes, just as rice or
similar substances do: but the consecrated fire, and the like, de-
ducible from the sacred institutes, do not give effect to actions
relative to secular purposes. (It is asked) does not a consecrated
fire effect the boiling of food, and so, of the rest? (The answer
is) No; for it is not as such, that the consecrated flame operates
the boiling of food; but, as a fire perceptible to the senses:
and so, in other cases. But, here, it is not through its visible
form, either gold or the like, that the purchase of a thing is
effected, but through property only. That, which is not a per-
son's property in a thing, does not give effect to his transfer of it
by sale or the like. Besides, the use of property is seen also among
inhabitants of barbarous countries, who are unacquainted with
the practices directed in the sacred code, for purchase, sale, and
similar transactions are observed among them.

Balambhatta's gloss.

9. Here is the author's view ; 'to this the answer is etc.' : he proceeds
to prove the property to be temporal by syllogistic reasoning (inference).
'Property' is the minor term, 'temporal purpose' is the major term and
'secular purpose' is the middle term (reason). He gives the 'example'
in the affirmative and negative forms, 'just as rice or similar substances.'
Accordingly,

1

Property is temporal

2. It is a means to transact temporal purpose

1.—] Whatever is a means to transact temporal purpose is temporal, as for example rice &c.

2. It is so, (property is a means to transact temporal purpose).

3. Property is temporal

11—1 Whatever is not temporal is (also) not a means to transact temporal purpose, as for example, the consecrated fire &c. It is an example of negation. 'Of the consecrated fire and the rest', 'hi', because He proceeds to show the defect in the pervasion by suggesting that if it were possible, the inference not manifest from negation is not reliable. 'Does not a consecrated fire &c.'? means that though it was non temporal, yet being used in cooking for temporal purpose the negative inference is defective, 'also' refers to rice &c. He proceeds to answer it, 'not so' though the consecrated fire has two fold form, its use for cooking is not from the scriptural texts, since the resorting to the cooking purpose is on account of the form of the temporal fire inferior to the form of the non temporal consecrated fire. It can not be done by means of the form of the non temporal consecrated fire, similarly if it were so, there will be no cooking by means of the temporal fire which is inferior in form to the non temporal consecrated fire. The same (result) does not happen every where by means of the general form, other wise by reason of its serving the secular object, the scriptural text would be meaningless, its being a means to temporal purpose is, therefore, based upon the result which accrues. There is, therefore, no defect in the pervasion. In the present case also viz. the gold &c. there should be a means of the worldly transactions of sale and purchase by the mere appearance of gold &c., but not by their being property. How can they be temporal? He proceeds to meet the objection by 'here &c.', 'through property only' means 'only by one who is possessed of it'. Harping on the same, he develops the same (argument), 'not so' (nahiti). He adduces a reason in support of the view that even the special transaction amongst the people does not establish the non temporal nature of the property 'and also' 'pratyantah' means barbarous country - it suggests the perpetual want of scriptural knowledge. It explains it 'unacquainted with' means 'ignorant of' &c. the barbarians. Now the use thereof is said to be in conformity with a standard; but where is the proof of the existence of the standard? How can you resume it (the proposition) to be proved? He therefore says, 'prahaso'.

किंच । नियतोपायकं स्वत्वं लोकसिद्धमेवेति न्यायविद्वेभ्यन्ते । तथाहि । लिप्सासूत्रे सूतीये धर्मेके द्रव्यार्जननियमान्न क्वचर्षत्ये स्वत्वमेव न स्यात् । स्वत्वस्या-
लौकिकत्वादिति पूर्वपक्षस्तन्मायमाशयः द्रव्यार्जनस्य प्रतिप्रहादिना स्वत्वसाधनत्वं
लोकसिद्धमिति पूर्वपक्षः समर्थितोमुच्यते । ननु च द्रव्यार्जनस्य क्वचर्षत्ये स्वत्वमेव न
भवतीति यत्तदप्यत्र न सत्येत । प्रलपितमिदं केनापिमार्जनं न । आपादयतीति विवक्षितं ।

विद्यमिति चक्षता । तथा सिद्धान्तेऽपि स्वत्वस्य लौकिकत्वमङ्गीर्यस्य विचारप्रयोजनं
मुक्तम् । अतो नियमातिक्रमः पुरुषस्य न कर्तोरिति । अस्य चार्थं एवं विवृतः । यथा
द्रव्यार्जननियमानां क्रम्यर्थत्वं तदा नियमार्जितेनैव द्रव्येण क्रतुसिद्धिः । नियमातिक्रमाजिं
तेन द्रव्येण न क्रतुसिद्धिरिति । न पुरुषस्य नियमातिक्रमदोषः पूर्वपक्षे । रासान्ते तु
अर्जननियमस्य पुरुषार्थत्वात्तदतिक्रमेणार्जितेनापि द्रव्येण क्रतुसिद्धिर्मवति । पुनरप्यस्यैव
नियमातिक्रमदोष इति नियमातिक्रमाजितस्यापि स्वत्वमङ्गीर्यम् । अन्यथा क्रतुसिद्धय-
भावात् ।

किञ्च *kim cha*, moreover, नियतोपायकम् *niyatopāyakam*, regulated
means of acquisition, स्वत्वम् *svatvam*, property, लोकसिद्धम् *loka-siddham*,
a matter of popular recognition, एव *eva*, also, इति *iti*, a participle, व्यापविद्
nyāya vidah, conversant with the science of reasoning सम्यन्वते *manyante*,
deem, तथाहि *tathāhi*, similarly, लिप्ता *lipat*, desire, सूत्रे *sūtre*, in the sūtra,
तृतीये *trītiye*, in the third, वर्णके *varṇake*, clause, द्रव्यार्जनं *dravyārjana*,
in the acquisition of goods, नियमानाम् *niyamānām*, restrictions, कर्तव्यत्वे
kratu arthatve, for the religious ceremony, स्वत्वम् *svatvam*, property,
एव *eva*, also, न *na*, not, स्यात् *syāt*, be, स्वत्वस्य *svatvasya*, of ownership,
अलौकिकत्वात् *alaukikatvāt*, by reason of being not temporal, इति *iti*, parti-
ciple, पूर्वपक्षे *pūrva pakṣe*, objection, असम्भवम् *asambhavam*, untenable,
आशङ्क्य *āśankya* considering, द्रव्यार्जनस्य *dravyārjanasya* of acquisition of
wealth, प्रतिग्रहादिना *pratigrahādina*, by acceptance and other modes, स्वत्व-
साधनत्वम् *svatva sādhanatvam*, the efficacy in instituting proprietary right,
लोकसिद्धम् *loka siddham*, is popularly recognized, इति *iti*, so, पूर्वपक्षः *pūrva-
pakṣah*, the first part, the objection, समर्थितः *samarthitah*, considered,
गुरुणा *gurunā* by the author, ननु *nanu*, is it not, does it not follow? , च
cha, and, द्रव्यार्जनस्य *dravyārjanasya*, the mode of acquiring goods, कर्तव्यत्वे
kratu arthatve, if it be such as concerns the sacrile or religious
ceremony, स्वत्वम् *svatvam*, any right of property एव *eva*, itself न *na*, not,
भवति *bhavati*, there is, इति *iti*, consequently, याग *yāgaḥ*, celebration of
a sacrifice, एव *eva*, itself, न *na*, not सर्वतस्त *samavarteta* would take place,
प्रलपितम् *pralapitam*, wrongly said, blunder, इदम् *idam*, this, it, केनापि
kena api, by any one (who affirms) अर्जनम् *arjanam*, acquisition, स्वत्वम्
svatvam, a proprietary right; न *na* not, आशङ्क्यति *āśalayati*, does pro-
duce, इति *iti*, this statement, विप्रतिषिद्धम् *vipratishedham*, it is contradic-
ted, it is a contradiction 'in terms', इति *iti*, so, thus चक्षता *chakṣatā*, by
him who says so, तथा *tatha*, accordingly, सिद्धान्ते *siddhante*, while stating
the demonstrated doctrine, अपि *api*, also स्वत्वस्य *svatvasya*, about pro-
perty, लौकिकत्वम् *laukikatvam*, the popular notion, चङ्गीर्यम् *aṅgīrīyam*,

having acknowledged , एव eva, again, indeed verily , विचार-प्रयोजनम् vichāra prayojanam the purpose of disquisition उक्तम् uktam is explained , अतः atah, therefore , नियमातिक्रमः niyama atikramah, a breach of the restriction , पुरुषस्य puruṣasya, affects the person , न na, not , कर्तो kratoh, the religious ceremony , इति iti, thus अस्या asya, of this passage च cha, and , अर्थ arthah the meaning , एवम् evam, thus, in this way विवृत-विवृतah, is explained , यथा yathā, if , द्रव्याग्नविग्रहणम् dravyāṅgana-niyamānām, the restrictions of the acquisition of chattels (इदम्) , कर्तव्यम् kratyarthatvam, regard the religious ceremony , तदा tadā, then , नियमान्तिव नियमāntitena, by that (material) which is obtained by those rules , एव eva, only (by) , द्रव्येण dravyena, by material क्रतुसिद्धिः kratu siddhiḥ, the perfection or completion , नियमातिक्रमार्जितेन niyamātikramārjitena, which is obtained by infringing the rules द्रव्येण dravyena, by that material , न na, not , क्रतुसिद्धिः kratu siddhiḥ, the perfection of the religious celebration , इति iti, so , न na, not , पुरुषस्य puruṣasya, affecting the person , नियमातिक्रमदोषः niyama atikrama doṣah, the fault of infringing the rules , पूर्वपक्षे pūrvapakṣe, according to the adverse opinion , रादाप्ते rāddhante, according to the demonstrated conclusion , तु tu, but , अर्जननियमस्य arjana-niyamasya, of the restriction regarding the acquisition , पुरुषार्थत्वाद् puruṣārthatvāt, since they affect the person , तदतिक्रमेण tad atikramena, by a breach of that , अर्जितेन arjitena, obtained , अपि api, even , द्रव्येण dravyena, with wealth , क्रतुसिद्धिः kratu siddhiḥ, the perfection of the religious rite , भवति bhavati, becomes, is affected, takes place , पुरुषस्य puruṣasya, on the part of the person एव eva, only , नियमातिक्रमः niyamātikrama, violating the rules , दोषः doṣah, the fault, offence , इति iti, consequently , नियमातिक्रमार्जितस्य niyamātikrama arjitasya, what is acquired by violating the rules , अपि api, even स्वत्वम् svatvam, is property , अङ्गीकृतम् aṅgīkṛitam, it is acknowledged अन्यथा anyathā, otherwise , क्रतुसिद्धिः kratu siddhiḥ, completion of ceremony , अभावात् ubhāvāt, because there would not be any, etc

10. Moreover, such as are conversant with the science of reasoning, deem regulated means of acquisition a matter of popular recognition. In the third clause of the Laṅkā Sutra, the venerable author has examined and pronounced untenable an objection to it, that, "if restrictions, relative to the acquisition of goods, apply to the religious ceremony, there could be no property, since proprietary right is not temporal" . (by showing that) "the efficacy of acceptance and other modes of acquisitions in

constituting proprietary right, is matter of popular recognition.' Does it not follow, "if the mode of acquiring the goods concern the religious ceremony, there can be no right of property, and consequently no celebration of a sacrifice"? (Answer.) "It is a blunder of any one who affirms that acquisition, does not produce a proprietary right, since this is a contradiction in terms". Accordingly, the author, having again acknowledged property to be a matter of popular recognition, when he states the demonstrated doctrine, proceeds to explain the purpose of the disquisition in this manner. 'Therefore, a breach of the restriction affects the person, not the religious ceremony;' and the meaning of this passage is thus expounded: 'If restrictions, respecting the acquisition of chattels, regard the religious ceremony, its celebration would be perfect with such property as was acquired consistently with those rules; and not so, if performed with wealth obtained by infringing them; and consequently, according to the objector's opinion, the fault would not affect the man, if he deviated from the rule: but, according to the demonstrated conclusion, since the restriction, regarding acquisition affects the person, the performance of the religious ceremony is complete, even with property acquired by a breach of the rule; and it is only an offence on the part of the man, because he has violated an obligatory rule.' It is consequently acknowledged, that even what is gained by infringing restrictions, is property: because, otherwise, there would be no completion of a religious ceremony.

Balambhatta's gloss.

10. The real nature of the property meets the approval of those who are conversant with the science of reasoning. Moreover, 'regulated means of acquisition' means acceptance of gifts, earning &c.; 'those who are conversant with the science of reasoning' means they also: how? On this question arising, he gives the said reply by 'as for example' (tathā hi): 'desire' means 'in the sūtra in which the word occurs i. e. Chapter IV. Pada 1, the second topic (which runs thus) "(puruṣārtha is that) in which there is love of a man and that love is indicated by (a certain) object (which) is inseparably connected (with it)"

Under the 1st head there is the discussion on the definition of the

Kratvartha and Puṣṭārtha under the second head there is a discussion as to whether milk, oil &c., are kratvartha or puṣṭārtha under the third head there is this discussion—the rules as to the acquisition of wealth from scattered texts—A Herakuna may earn wealth by acceptance of gifts & a king by victory &c., a Vaiśya by agriculture &c. Doubt arises whether they (earnings) are kratvartha or puṣṭārtha. Here is the objector's view even on (assuming) their real nature and not accepting the rule to be for the religious purpose by reason of the absence of an authorized person, it is proper that the distribution of wealth by means of an agent (to obviate) the meaninglessness of the *vidhi* is for the religious purpose. The meaning is just as in acquiring wealth spent in religious ceremony, (as for instance) he purchases soma &c., the rule about the acquisition of wealth is for the religious purpose similarly are the rules relating to the acceptance of gifts &c. otherwise, the rule relating to the acquisition of wealth by reason of being of no use in effecting transactions and removing hunger &c., will be meaningless. Further there is no context to show that it is for a religious purpose, nor can it be said to be a case of disparity. On the contrary it is proved to be a subsidiary part by the force of the sacrifice dependent on the invisible means and the force of the rule depending on the invisible object. It can be urged that there can be no living, if all the earnings are for a religious purpose, because it can be accomplished with earnings by improper means, or if the sacrificial rite be for one's own interest by reason of the sacrifice being not capable of accomplishment with utlivelhood, it follows that the wealth acquired by lawful means is for the purpose of living. It is an illustration of earning wealth in the shape of acquisition of wealth. The writer of Tantrasāra (Pārthasārthi) has said contrary to the Vārtika and reason, for it should be borne in mind that in the Mīmāṃsā, there is investigation of the duties to be performed.

He thus decides, commencing from 'property' and ending with 'raising objection' 'On the rules relating to the acquisition of wealth being for the sacrifice, by the property being non temporal, by the non production of a temporal reason, by the intervention of the Vedic cause, by the regulated means such as acceptance &c. being for the sacrifice, by being for any other object and by the absence of the production of an effect from any cause on account of the want of the proprietary right by reason of non accrual of proprietary right, the sacrifice can not be accomplished. The objector's view that rules are with the religious object is untenable. It is the meaning (it is how the matter stands)

He supports it, 'of acquisition of goods' it is connected with the opposite. While discussing, "we should acquire wealth by means of officiating a priest &c.," it has been already explained. Here 'acceptance' (pratigraha) means a 'particular acceptance' earning means a just 'wealth'. One should therefore, desire wealth 'by officiating as priests &c., so it is said positively in the smṛiti. We should worship God for acquisition and protection of wealth' I—100

The original text signifies the means of earning

"Out of six, three callings are his means of livelihood, officiating as a priest teaching and acceptance (of gift) from a pious (man) M. X 76. It follows from Manu. The rules as to acceptance &c., for the acquisition of proprietary right by means of using wealth in a sacrifice, are for the religious object, just as the act of threshing which removes the husk by reason of rice being used in a sacrifice becomes a sacrificial object. But old people consider that proprietary right by birth as that of a son like the proprietary right acquired by an acquirer in the thing acquired in the form of the relationship of the proprietary right and the proprietor, is temporal, because it is asserted that the relation of an action and the agent (nominative) save and except the other cases depends on an action whether scriptural or non scriptural. The relationship of an agent and action depending on an action as said by (Hori) Hārīta is well known among people and does not stand in need of any other proof. On the cessation of the action of earning, the result thereof does not necessarily cease, because the substratum in the shape of relationship exists. On the action of the father ceasing, paternal (relationship) does not come to an end. Though the proprietary right is temporal, yet by accomplishing the sacrificial object, its absence does not follow' this is the essence.

Is it that in acquiring the proprietary right by earning, the above-said rules being for the sacrificial object and the earning being also for the sacrificial and other objects there is no propriety? The absence of sacrifice remains in the same state, the view of the objector is not proved. thus he says "Does it not (.....) of a sacrifice", he ridicules it and rejects it, 'uttered a nonsense (pralipitam) means that earning does not produce proprietary right is a nonsense uttered by some one, because both are contradictory, or it means that some one has uttered a non-sense, here is a reason assigned 'Earning' because &c.) 'its *śānta*' is connected with the 'garuḥ' (Prabhākara) earning is synonymous with the duty of an earner as explained previously and the relationship of the property with its owner. It is two-sided like father and son (correlative), because without a thing earned, for want of earning, the act of earning does not produce proprietary right and like the expression, 'my mother is barren' is self contradictory.

If the objector's view is erroneous, it can not be the author's view (demonstrated truth), therefore he says in the demonstrated truth also (*aidhanta api*) it is thus. When a person is entitled and bent on earning wealth on his acquiring it, it is improper to apply the rules thereof to a sacrifice. When a person is desirous of wealth, he is engaged out of affection but not by rules, by reason of his engagement in it against the rules, the injunction relating to it does not become meaningless. Moreover, on all sorts of earning being for the sacrificial purpose, the entire earning is for sacrificial purpose, there being no means of livelihood (*āsta*) the whole sacrifice fails. On the contrary, on the inference arising from the texts suggesting both the sacrificial and temporal objects ordinarily it is not merely for the sacrificial object. The reference to earning of wealth is therefore, not by reason of the sacrifice being for a religious purpose but by reason of its being for a secular purpose. Other

wise, there will be a contradiction with reference to earning of wealth for a sacrifice as mentioned in the sixth chapter "Of the first three castes, only person possessed of wealth (is entitled to perform a sacrifice)", because accomplishment of an act depends on wealth" (Mīmamsa VI 1 89 at p 310 of vol XXVIII of S II H) There is another anomaly "An initiated one begs alms for twelve nights and purchases soma", under which begging of alms &c, by prohibiting earning of wealth is enjoined,* and earning of wealth by other means is considered a sin. It can be said that its result is not the earning of wealth like 'let gold be worn' (see at 130 132 of Jaimini's Mīmamsa S II H) It is possible where the result is visible by reason of the unlawfulness of the invisible result. The rules are, therefore, with the temporal object though they are laid down there properly yet like the sacred thread &c, they should be understood with both objects, therefore "let a twice-born always perform (a sacrifice) with wealth earned lawfully", fits in with the Twentyfour views,† similarly earning also. Therefore livelihood &c, quoted before from Manu (see p 15) should be considered as relevant. The sum and substance is that it appears to be the siddhānta view that wealth accomplishing all objects is for secular purpose and the rules relating thereto are also with that purpose. 'Disquisition' means the purpose of the disquisition under the topic (adhiḥkārṇa). He explains the nature of the object of the demonstrated doctrine (siddhānta) "Therefore a breach of the restriction" means the fault arising therefrom, therefore he develops it "The meaning of this means "of the work full of purpose is the original text", 'expounded' by the Guru (Prabhākara) = understood "If, deviated to the rule" means "with the end of the text"; in the objector's view, there is thereby no fault of the man, but by reason of the failure of the sacrifice, the sacrifice is not thereby accomplished. But according to the siddhānta view by reason of a man violating them there is the fault of the man but not the failure of the sacrifice, it is the purpose 'Eva' is with a view to distinction 'in the objector's view' (Pūrvapakṣa) is connected with the previous 'is' is the reading. But in the view of the objector earning of wealth being a part of a ceremony the wealth which is essential should be acquired before the commencement of the ceremonies, there being no authority of acquiring it at a particular time. There is no sin even on the failure of the ceremony on the non acquisition of the wealth at that time, because a person of means is entitled to it. On the contrary, in the siddhānta (demonstrated conclusion) a ceremony should be performed with the wealth acquired previously. According to the objector's view the earnings from the acceptance of gifts etc, should be taken for the religious purpose but according to the demonstrated conclusion, it should be accomplished by any means, by this what Rāṣṭra (Nyāya) and, the commentary on Tantravārtika by Śomeśvara Bhāṭṭa has said, is refuted. It is like the sin arising on non observance of the restrictive rules by happening of the undesired events to a man, by reason of the fault arising from the misfortune from the hardship undergone for the sacrifice which fails for want of the fruit of the sacrifice obtainable with difficulty. Hence in the topic relating to low castes it is said 'a

* See Mīmamsa at p. 411 of vol XXV of S II H

† Dr. Gangadhar Jha informs me that अङ्गिरसस्मृत्य is the name of some work

Sādra should not be taught'; on a Sādra violating the prohibition there is a failure of the sacrifice, and a sin in addition. So it is said by the commentator (Śābara). It should be accordingly borne in mind.

At the conclusion of the subject under discussion, he gives the result. "Even what is gained by infringing restrictions" means 'and similarly' etc., i. e. by the author holding the siddhānta view: 'even' suggests the Kaṇṭhika maxim see p. 9 of vol. XXVIII; P. XXXI of vol. XXIX of S. B. H)* 'Other wise' means there will be no proprietary right in the earnings by violation of the rules. The rules being for the religious object and by the acquisition being for it, the property becomes non-temporal, there being no proprietary right, the livelihood is impossible; from the absence (of livelihood) follows the failure (of the sacrifice).

Mitākṣarā

न चैतावता चौर्यादिप्राप्तस्यापि स्वत्वं स्यादिति मन्तव्यम् । लोके तत्र स्वत्व-
प्रसिद्धयभावात् व्यवहारविस्तयावात् । ११ ॥

न na, not; च cha, and, चैतावता etāvatā, by this; चौर्यादि cōuryādi, by robbery and other nefarious acts; प्राप्तस्य prāptasya, of what is obtained, अपि api, even; स्वत्वम् svatvam, the right of being property; स्यात् syāt, should be (not न), इति iti, so; मन्तव्यम् mantavyam, should be thought, alleged; लोके loka, in the world; तत्र tatra, there, in such cases; स्वत्व svatva, of proprietary right, प्रसिद्धि prasiddhi, of recognition; अभावात् abhāvāt, through the absence of, there being no etc.; व्यवहार vyavahāra, with received practice; विस्तारत् विस्तारāt, owing to disagreement with.

11. If should not be alleged, that even what is obtained by robbery and other nefarious means, would be property. For proprietary right in such instances is not recognized by the world; and it disagrees with received practice.

Balambhatta's gloss.

11 If you accept the proprietary right to accrue in the earning made by the breach of the rules, there will be proprietary right even in the property obtained by theft. Therefore, suggesting the removal of the anomaly, he says. "It should not be alleged etc.," meaning 'no'; he removes

* "Rhetorical flourish, meant to indicate that what applies to a remote case, a *fortiori* applies to a case close at hand, should not literally be understood" R. I. Bharar's *Uttama* lectures p. 295. "Where there are means at hand to explain the most difficult subject, one can explain an easy subject without difficulty." *Yāchajatsa* vol. V. p. 4152. Where one is skilful in shooting a lion, it is not difficult for him to shoot a fox in hunting. These are illustrations of the Kaṇṭhika maxim. It is derived from *Kim+Uta* meaning 'how much more?' or 'how much less?' It is a principle of a *fortiori*.

thereby the futility of the reason, 'it disagrees with received practice' means 'by not recognising it in the well known transaction of sale'

Mitākāra

एवं प्रतिग्रहाद्युपायके स्वत्वे लौकिके स्थिते ब्राह्मणस्य प्रतिग्रहादयउपायाः । सत्रियस्य विजितादयो वैश्यस्य कृष्यादयः । शूद्रस्य शूद्रपादयश्च ह्यार्यनियमा रिकषादयस्तु सर्वसाधारणः । स्वामी रिकषक्यसविभागपरिग्रहाधिममेषिस्तुक्ता । १२ ॥

एवं *Evam*, thus, प्रतिग्रहादि *pratigrahādi*, by acceptance and any other, उपायके *upāyake*, by means such as acceptance etc, स्वत्वे *svatve* property लौकिके *laukike*, temporal, स्थिते *sth* to, being established ब्राह्मणस्य *brāhmaṇasya*, for a *brāhmaṇa*, प्रतिग्रहादयः *pratigrahādayah*, acceptance etc, उपाया *upāyāḥ*, means, सत्रियस्य *kṣatriyasya* for a *kṣatriya*, विजितादयः *vijitādayah*, conquest etc, वैश्यस्य *vaiśyasya*, for a *vaiśya*, कृष्यादय *kṛṣyādayah*, husbandry etc, शूद्रस्य *śūdrasya*, for a *śūdra*, शूद्रपादय *śūdrapādayah*, service and the rest, इति *iti*, so, अद्रिगार्थं *adrigārtha*, for spiritual purposes, नियमः *niyamāḥ*, restrictions, रिषादयः *rikṣādayah*, inheritance and others, तु *tu*, but, सर्वसाधारणः *sarva-sādharaṇāḥ*, common to all, स्वामी *svāmī*, an owner is, रिष रिक्ता *rikṭha* inheritance, क्रय *kṛaya*, purchase, सविभाग *savibhāga*, partition, परिग्रहा *parigraha*, seizure; अधिगमे *adhigame*, finding; इति *iti*, so, उक्ताः *ukṭāḥ*, are stated

12 Thus, since property, obtained by acceptance or any other (sufficient) means, is established to be temporal, the acceptance of alms, as well as other (prescribed) modes for a Brahmana, conquest and similar means for a Kshatriya, husbandry and the like for a Vaiśya, and service and the rest for a Śūdra, are propounded as restrictions intended for spiritual purposes, and inheritance and other modes are stated as means common to all "An owner's by inheritance purchase, partition, seizure, or finding".

Balambhatta's gloss

12 In this way having established the temporal nature of the property, he repels the futility of the uncommon injunction 'Similarly acceptance' etc, (evam prati) 'vijita' (conquest) is derived by adding *ktā* to denote an abstract noun and means victory etc, 'prescribed modes' should be repeated every where in the following (passage) 'Spiritual' (*adrigā*) means 'wealth is for spiritual purpose' or in other words the restrictive rules are for spiritual purpose. Even in the absence of the injunctive text, he proceeds to repeat the above mentioned arguments to support the non secular nature of the property and to show the

intuity of Gautam's text having complete enumeration (see placitum 8 at p. 8) "Inheritance....." should be referred to. 'All' includes 'mixed race' in order to enumerate them, he says, "an owner."

Mitākṣarā

तत्राप्रतिबन्धोदायोऽपि कथम् । प्रसिद्धः । संविभागः सप्रतिबन्धोदायाः । प्रतिग्रहोऽन्यऽप्यस्य जलतृष्णाद्यादेः स्वीकारः । अधिगमो निष्प्रादेः प्राप्तिः । एतेषु निमित्तेषु सत्सु स्वामी भवति । कृतेषु ज्ञायते स्वामी ब्राह्मणस्याधिकं लब्धमिति ब्राह्मणस्य प्रतिग्रहादिना यज्ञं तदधिक्यसाधारणम् । क्षत्रियस्य विजितमित्यत्राधिकमित्यनुवर्तते । क्षत्रियस्य विजयदण्डादिलब्धमसाधारणम् । निर्विघ्नं वैश्यस्योदायिरिति । अत्राप्यधिकमित्यनुवर्तते । वैश्यस्य विगोराद्यादिलब्धं निर्विघ्नं तदसाधारणम् । शूद्रस्य द्विजश्रद्धादिना भृतिकणेन यज्ञं तदसाधारणम् । यद्यमनुलोमजानां प्रतिलोमजानाम् च लोकप्रसिद्धेषु यत्नहेतुषु यद्यसाधारणमुक्तं सुतानामभसारणमित्यादि तत्तत्सर्वं निर्विघ्नं ज्ञेयं नोच्यते । सर्वस्यापि भृतिकपत्वाभिर्विशोभृतिभोग्योरिति । भिकाएडीस्मरणात् तत्तदसाधारणं चेदित्यम् । १३ ॥

तत्र *intra*, there ; अप्रतिबन्धः *apratibandhaḥ*, unobstructed ; दायः *dāyaḥ*, heritage ; रिणम् *ṛiṇam*, inheritance ; क्रयः *krayaḥ*, purchase ; प्रसिद्धः *prasiddhaḥ*, well known ; संविभागः *samvibhāgaḥ*, partition ; सप्रतिबन्धः *sapratibandhaḥ*, subject to obstruction ; दायः *dāyaḥ*, heritage ; प्रतिग्रहः *pratigrahaḥ*, occupation or seizure ; अन्यपूर्वस्य *ananyapūrvasya*, not previously appertaining to ; जलतृष्णादेः *jala-tṛṣṇādeḥ*, of water, wood and the like ; स्वीकारः *svīkāraḥ*, appropriation ; अधिगतः *adhi-gamaḥ*, finding, discovery, एतेषु *eteṣu*, these, निमित्तेषु *nimitteṣu*, the causes ; सत्सु *sat-su*, being, एतेषु..... सत्सु, if these causes exist, स्वामी *svāmī*, owner ; भवति *bhavati*, becomes ; कृतेषु *kṛiteṣu*, if they take place, ज्ञायते *jñāyate*, is known, becomes ; स्वामी *svāmī*, proprietor ; ब्राह्मणस्य *brāhmaṇasya*, for a brāhmaṇa, अधिकम् *adhikam*, additional ; लब्धम् *labdham*, that which is obtained, इति *iti*, so, माह्वरि *brāhmaṇasya*, for a brāhmaṇa ; प्रतिग्रहादिना *pratigrahaḍinā*, by acceptance etc. ; यद् यद् *yad yad*, which ; लब्धम् *labdham*, is obtained, तद् तद् *tad tad*, that, अधिकम् *adhikam*, additional ; असाधारणम् *asādhāraṇam*, not common ; क्षत्रियस्य *kṣatriyasya*, for a kṣatriya ; विजितम् *vi-jitam*, what is obtained by victory ; इति *iti*, so ; अत्र *atra*, here ; अधिकम् *adhikam*, additional, इति *iti*, this (the word additional) ; अनुवर्तते *anuvartate*, is understood, follows, is repeated ; क्षत्रियस्य *kṣatriyasya*, for a kṣatriya, विजय *vi-jaya*, by victory, दण्डादि *danda ādi*, or by amercement or the like, लब्धम् *labdham*, is obtained ; असाधारणम् *asādhāraṇam*, not common (to all the tribes) निर्विघ्नम् *nirviṣṭam*, what is earned ; वैश्य-

शूद्रयो vaiśya śūdrayoh for a vaiśya and śūdra, इति it, so चत्र atra, here, अपि api too, अक्षिणम् adlikam, the word 'additi nal', इति iti, this, अनुवर्तते anuvartate 'is repeated' is understood, वैश्यस्य vaiśyasya, for a vaiśya, इति kṛm, by agriculture गोरक्षादि gorakṣādi, by keeping of cattle etc लाभम् labdham, obtained, निर्विष्टम् nirviṣṭam earned, तद् tad, that, असाधारणम् asādhāraṇam, peculiar, शूद्रस्य śūdrasya, for a śūdra, द्वित्रिशुभ्रविद्या dvitriśuśubhravidyā, by means of service of the twice-born, भृतिरूपेण bhṛtirūpeṇa, in the form of of wages यद् yad, which, लब्धम् labdham, obtained, तद् tad, that, असाधारणम् asādhāraṇam, is peculiar, एवम् evam, so, अनुलोमजानाम् anulomajānām, to certain classes mixed in the natural order of tribes ; प्रतिलोमजानाम् pratilomajānām, to certain classes mixed in the reverse order of tribes, च चा, and, लोकप्रसिद्धेषु lokprasiddheṣu, which are familiar to mankind स्वर्ग-इत्युच्यते svarga-ityu-ahyate, among the causes of property, यद् यद् yad yad, whatever, असाधारणम् asādhāraṇam, peculiar, उक्तम् uktam, has been stated, सूतानाम् sūtānām, of the sūtas, अश्वमारणम् aśvasārathyam, the driving of horses, इत्यादि itī ādi, and so forth तत् तत् tat tat, that, सर्वम् sarvam, all, निर्विष्ट-शब्देन nirviṣṭa śabdēn, by the word 'nirviṣṭa' is 'earned', उच्यते uchyate, is indicated, सर्वम् sarvasya, all (such acquisitions), अपि api, also श्रुतकारणम् bhṛtirūpāt, for they assume the form of wages भृति, निर्वेश nirveśa wages भृति-भोगयोः bhṛti-bhoga-yoh in the sense of wages and enjoyment, इति it, so ; त्रिकान्दी-स्मरणात् trikāndī smarnāt, as indicated by the dictionary of Amara which has three parts १० (काण्ड) kandas, तत् तत् tat tat, all that, असाधारणम् asādhāraṇam, as peculiar, वेदिनस्य veditavyam, should be understood

18. Unobstructed heritage is here denominated "inheritance." "Purchase" is well known. "Partition" means heritage subject to division. "Occupation" or seizure is the appropriation of water, grass, wood and the like not previously appertaining to any other [person as owner.] "Finding" is the discovery of a hidden treasure or the like. "If these reasons exist, the person is owner." If they take place, he becomes proprietor "For a Brahmana, that which is obtained by acceptance or the like, is additional, not common [to all the tribes] "Additional" is understood in the subsequent sentence, 'for a Kshatriya, what is obtained by victory, or by amercement or the like, is peculiar' In the next sentence, "additional" is again understood "what is gained or earned by agriculture, keeping of cattle, [traffic,] and so

forth, is for a Vaiśya peculiar; and so is, for a Śādra, that which is earned in the form of wages, by obedience to the regenerate classes and by similar means." Thus likewise, among the various causes of property which are familiar to mankind, whatever has been stated as peculiar to certain mixed classes in the direct or inverse order of the tribes, (as the driving of horses, which is the profession of the sutas, and so forth,) is indicated by the word "earned" (nirviṣṭa): for all such acquisitions assume the form of wages or hire; and the noun (nirveśā) is explained in the Trikaṇḍī as signifying wages.

Bḍlambhatta's gloss.

Here (tatra) means 'of those'; 'not previously appertaining to any other' 'of that which is not owned by any one' (res nullius); having explained the categories, he proceeds to explain the meaning of the passage. 'They', is to show the appropriateness of what is laid down; 'becomes' shows that every thing is with that object. 'If these reasons exist, the person is owner' means 'If these reasons are known (to exist) the owner is known; by this, the view of the objector is repelled, because there is success with that object. He proceeds to explain the meaning of the succeeding passage. 'For a Brahman', over and above; he says by filling up the ellipsis by reason of its inherent power, being in conformity with another text and being concomitant with it. 'Acceptance'; 'additional' shows 'its excellence'; 'peculiar' i. e. 'conquered' is a figurative expression standing for victory. 'Amercement'; 'additional' is understood; it is the reading. He says with the object of earning for enjoyment; agriculturists etc., include earning by trade etc. In order to remove the anomaly, he applies the said principle elsewhere. 'Thus, likewise'; 'they are peculiar of those which end in the genitive case' should be connected here also; "among the causes of the proprietary right" means 'of them': 'all that' means 'of them.'

Mitākṣarā

यद्यपि पत्नी दुहितरश्चेत्यादिस्मरणं तत्रापि स्यामसिम्बन्धितया बहुषु दायविभागितया प्राप्तेषु लोकाप्रसिद्धेऽपि स्वत्वे व्यामोहनिवृत्त्यर्थं स्मरणमिति सर्वमनवयम् । १४॥

यद्यपि yad api, as; पत्नी patnī, the wife (that has become the widow); दुहितरः duhitaraḥ, daughters; च chha, and; इत्यादि itīdī, etc स्मरणम् smaraṇam, the declaration, तत्र tatra, there, in that text; अपि api, too; दायविभागितया dāya vibhāgitayā, by reason of their affinity to the late owner; बहुषु bahūḥ, among many persons, दायविभागितया dāya vibhāgitayā, because they (are supposed to be) entitled to share (विभ.गि) the heritage (दाय); प्राप्तेषु prāptēṣu, being supposed, when they are supposed to be etc.

लोकप्रसिद्धे loka prasiddhe, though it is a matter familiar to the world, अपि api, even दासत्वे svatve, the proprietary right, दशमोह व्युत्पत्त्या, mistake, निवृत्त्यपमं nivṛtṭi artham, for the purpose of proving; दशमम् amarnam is the declaration, इति it, therefore; सद्यः sarvaṁ, the whole, अनवद्यम् anvadyam, = unexceptionable

14 As for the precept respecting the succession of the widow and the daughters, &c., the declaration (of the order of succession,) even in that text is intended to prevent mistake, although the right of property be a matter familiar to the world, where many persons might (but for that declaration).

Balambhatta's gloss

14 If the property were temporal the text as to 'wife and daughter etc', (see II 135) would be contradictory, because by reason of the absence of the owner the wife etc, have been declared entitled. In order to remove the anomaly arising by the way, though not explained before and stated merely by Gautama, he states 'Although' etc, 'there also' means 'in the text'; 'in their absence' is understood. There is another reading 'order of succession' (krama amarnam), otherwise 'even there' becomes incongruous. In this way, the semblance of contradiction with other smṛities should be removed, there is then, no contradiction of the texts

Here it should be borne in mind, what is that proprietary right which is said to be temporal by the siddhānti (proponent)? It is not an object of the means prohibited by the scripture but of lawful and free modes of transactions of sale and acceptance of gift, it can not be known by the external organs of sense it may be said that the special mental cognition of the acceptance etc, being the object of special mental cognition and the statement with the object of its impropriety are nearly explained. Because even after the cessation of the acceptance, there is the accrual of proprietary right by virtue of the transaction, e.g., by gift etc, the proprietary right ceases (in one) and is created (in another) by acceptance etc. If that were not so by reason of accepting the cessation (of the ownership) by gift and its creation by acceptance of a particular thing, even then it is an object of perception by the external organs of sense by reason of the ordinary practice 'I see the property'. It is not an unwarrantable stretch of a rule, by reason of the knowledge thereof on realisation, it is like the proprietary right residing therein and the unchecked and free use thereof. Therefore on not taking it into possession, or its being used freely according to one's wishes and on its seizure by the exercise of proprietary right wrongfully, there is no possession thereof. From this the proprietary right is inferred, on the other hand it is not an object of sensual perception (and one can not say) 'I see the proprietary right as 'I perceive a smelling

sandal' Thus the view of the opponent is repelled by reason of its being refuted elsewhere

The gifts are of two kinds one is of which the fruit is visible and the other of which the fruit is not visible They are subdivided into two, one with acceptance and the other without it Although 'gift with acceptance' is mere acceptance, yet (in the passage) 'let a Brahmana earn wealth by acceptance (of gift)' by reason of the prohibition enjoined by the śūriti texts as regards the acceptance of gift of horse and sesamum, the word acceptance 'of gift' (prati-graha) means the acceptance of the donation for invisible purpose On the acceptance of sesamum and horse given as reward, no one is in fault nor is there any breach of rule as regards earning by a warrior The reward should be said to be for visible object The word (dāna) is derived from √ d meaning relinquishment of one's proprietary right in order to create it in another

On the other hand, the creation of the proprietary right in another does not merely depend on the relinquishment of one's proprietary right, but it must be said that it arises in reality by acceptance only On simply giving up a cow in favour of a Brahmana (saying) 'the cow belongs to the Brahmana, it is not mine' even with the full knowledge of the relinquishment by all present the proprietary right arises by acceptance Therefore (in cases like) 'let one offer funeral cakes to the manes' there is the illustration of the fourth (gift without acceptance) on the suspension of the proprietary right in the thing offered to the manes by reason of the want of acceptance and by reason of the reality of dedication made to the manes in compliance with the above said meaning of √ dā Under the belief of an owner being abroad, the possession by acceptance of his relinquished property and then on the death of the owner, possession after partition of his property by his sons etc., as inheritance but not by any other are the common occurrences; otherwise there will be an offence in a stranger's taking possession of his wealth like them, as in obtaining forest grass etc In this way the acceptance of a gift should not be considered to be useless by reason of the text 'It is right times meritorious to accept it', because of the accrual of the excessive reward on the gift of such accepted wealth On the other hand, the word of quantity is with a view to save the non use of the passage (one gives) in a context where the subject of reunion is discussed and on the creation of the joint property after the extinction of the separate property

Nor is there no extinction of proprietary right, on obviating the undue stretch of a rule by the extinction of the proprietary right, the word of quantity is needless there also by assuming the extinction of previous proprietary right by non accrual of it in the proprietor of it On accepting the existing force of volition, there is some force; thereby there is no extinction of the proprietary right but mere creation of the proprietary right in another on the other hand the creation of the proprietary right in one who is possessed of it, by the stimulating force of the volition is refuted It can

not be said that there is wrong in overlooking it, because by not creating proprietary right in an other, there is no applicability of the passage 'he gives'. Similarly it does not apply in the case of sale by reason of its non-creation of proprietary right according to the rules. In such a case to obviate the undue extension of the rule, the proprietary right arises by the previous acceptance of the sale consideration. In this way, by the word 'gift etc.', the same applies in the case of sale, because the extinction and creation of the right take place in both of them. It should not be said that the right arising from gift etc. is useless and improper. The text is with a view to support the creation of the right arising from it and inferable from the scripture even on its production from the temporal agents and inferable from the evidence thereof.

Similarly by "A Brahman by acceptance of gift etc., .. owner by inheritance" the acceptance etc., are clearly said to be essential, not by the last clause even on so describing, but by the first, the essential nature arises by earning but not by the proprietary right, earning may be said, as described previously, as constituting profit and loss the means of acquiring wealth. Just like the purport of the text, 'let one who is possessed of wealth by acceptance of gifts etc., appropriate wealth by earning it', it is also acquired by the same means. Therefore 'let wealth be earned by means of sacrifice etc.' means that gift etc. are the means of acquiring proprietary right in earning wealth by acceptance of gift etc., as explained previously. The act of acceptance of gift etc., is therefore, an earning and like it, it is also a means thereof.

There is the following order in the creation (of a right) in the beginning, there is relinquishment, then acceptance of gift, then earning, then proprietary right. The middle two (constituents) do not exist by (the non-existence of) the first, similarly in other cases. Similarly in 'creation by acceptance of gift', creation is apparently a common factor, etc., include like officiating as a priest, teaching, victory, agriculture, service, relinquishment of like things, inheritance which is common and anything effected by sale. There the real nature of the acceptance of gift etc., and relinquishment and sale is explained and the real nature of the acceptance of gift and finding like them is obvious. By 'inheritance' (riksha) is meant the mere relationship with the owner arising from heritage, by partition is meant the absence of the particular abstraction of that kind, their non-contradictory nature was explained previously, so there is nothing wrong. The partition as described previously does not create proprietary right being a part thereof (compound forming with heritage). This is the reason why Gautama and others have not included it amongst causes. 'By partition arises proprietary right' is the subject for discussion according to others, in the text of Gautama the word 'samvibhāga' (partition) means 'partition'; it is not what was described previously but is well known idea (of partition) which by removing the doubt support the established truth. There is then no contradiction. In this way the proprietary right is inferable from enjoyment etc., perceivable by all visible means of proof, applicable to common and uncommon above said objects, extinguishable on partition like gift and

purchase, अव जयः conquest प्रयोग prayogah trade, कर्मयोगः karma-yogah employment च cha, and, सत्परिग्रहः satparigrahaḥ, acceptance from a proper person, एव eva, also, च cha, and, इति iti, thus, मनु स्मृत्याḥ Manu smarnāt, since Manu declares

16 The purpose of the preceding disquisition is this. A text expresses "When Brāhmins have acquired wealth by a blamable act, they are cleared by the abandonment of it, with prayer and rigid austerity : Now, if property be deducible only from sacred ordinances that, which has been obtained by accepting presents from an improper person, or by other means which are reprobated, would not be property, and consequently would not be partible among sons. But if it be a worldly matter, then even what is obtained by such means, is property and may be divided among heirs, and the atonement above mentioned regards the acquirer only but sons have the right by inheritance, and therefore no blame attaches to them, since Manu declares, "There are seven virtuous means of acquiring property, viz., inheritance, &c."

Balambhatta's gloss

Now in the present discourse, it is not proper to enquire into the real nature of the proprietary right by reason of the non use of the subdivisions into temporal and non temporal. He therefore says 'The purpose of the preceding disquisition etc.' abandonment means 'giving up', he says 'not by that alone (but) by prayer' also he means, by this sanction of abandonment by Manu. He states the view of the opponent, 'from sacred ordinances', the reprehensible is of two kinds, one that is prohibited and the other that is not laid down. 'Accepting presents from an improper person', in the established truth, he removes the contradiction of the text. By 'giving it up', he says by suggesting the distinction by 'only' (eva). 'The sons, can there be a transmission of sin like inheritance? He therefore says 'seven', these are the means to acquire wealth here the term 'inheritance' includes both inheritance and partition the word 'acquisition' includes acceptance by gift and finding; 'victory' includes fine; 'trade' includes agriculture etc., 'employment' includes acceptance of reward; from it both should be understood

* The sloka of Manu has not been translated by Colebrook. I give the translation from Bühler. There are seven lawful modes of acquiring property, (viz.) inheritance, finding or friendly donation purchase conquest lending at interest, the performance of work and the receipt of gift from virtuous men S. B. E. XXV P. 426

It is proper to discuss the subject promised according to the promise but not otherwise how is it contrary here? nor is there any other different reason by virtue of its absence. There is no argument based on a series of reasons by virtue of the dependence of the present discussion on the temporal nature of the proprietary right nor does the maxim of needle and kettle* apply here by reason of proving its temporal nature from many arguments and by seeing (no proof of) any other. If you say that a subject discussed and one to be discussed are both in an unfavourable position, the reply is that it is not so. Like property by the temporal nature of partition, by the non temporal nature of the rules relating to it and by the temporal nature of both act, the temporal nature of the proprietary right in the above said ways has already been proved, there the creation of it from of partition etc, applies but not otherwise the subject discussed is a reason and the subject to be discussed is, therefore, based on a reason. Its immediate discussion is therefore, proper. it is the substance

Mitākṣara

इदानीमिदं संदिह्यते । विभागस्तत्त्वमुत स्वस्य सतोविभाग इति । १७ ॥

इदानीम् *Idānīm*, now, next, इदम् *idam*, this, it *संदिह्यते sandihyate*, is doubted, विभागम् *vibhāgam*, through partition, स्वत्वम् *svatvam*, property, एव *eva*, or, स्वस्य *svasya*, the proprietary right, सतः *sataḥ*, being already there, विभाग *vibhāgaḥ*, partition, इति *iti*, thus the doubt,

17 Next, it is doubted whether property arises from partition, or the division be of an existent right

Mitākṣara

तत्र विभागस्तत्त्वमिति तावद्युक्तम् । जातपुत्रस्याधानविधानात् । यदि जन्म-
नैव स्वतत्वं स्यात्तदोत्पन्नस्य पुत्रस्यापि तत्त्व साधारणमिति द्वयसाधेष्वाधानादिपु-
त्रिपुत्रधिकारः स्यात् । १८ ॥

तत्र *Tatra*, of these (positions) विभागात् *-vibhāgāt*, arising from partition, स्वत्वम् *svatvam*, property, इति *iti*, this position, तावद् *tāvad*, indeed, युक्तम् *yuktam*, right, जातपुत्रस्य *jātaputrasya*, of a man to whom a son is born, आधान-विधानात् *ādhāna vibhānāt*, because of the enjoining (विधान) (by the scripture) to maintain a holy fire (आधान), यदि *yadi*, if, जन्मना *janmanā*, by birth, एव *eva*, alone, स्वत्वम् *svatvam*, property, स्यात् *syāt*, would be, तदा *tadā*, then, उत्पन्नस्य *utpannasya*, of one just born, पुत्रस्य *utrasya*, of a son, अपि *api*, even, तत् *tat*, that, स्वम् *svam*,

* When there are two acts to be performed, one easier and the other more difficult, at a time, the easier one should be performed first

property estate ; साधारणम् sādharanam, would be common ; इति iti, and, hence , द्रव्यकार्येषु dravya-kāryeṣu, that are accomplished by the use (साध्) of wealth (द्रव्य) . आधानादिवु ādhānādīva, in matters such as maintaining the sacred fire etc पितुः pituh, of the father ; अनधिकारः anadhikārah, inability ; स्यात् syāt, there would be.

18. Of these (positions), that of property arising from partition is right, since a man, to whom a son is born, is enjoined to maintain a holy fire: for, were property vested by birth alone, the state would be common to the son as soon as born; and the father would not be competent to maintain a sacrificial fire, and perform other religious duties which are accomplished by the use of wealth.

Balambhatta's gloss.

17 and 18 Harping on the same, he says, now* (īdanim) meaning next; so it should be understood that with the said object the word 'now' is used 'It is doubted'; he supports the enunciated proposition containing the above-said doubt in the enunciated proposition first. Is it from partition? 'There' (tatra), means 'between two.' 'Born', he means 'let one who has black hair and to whom a son is born, maintain a holy fire', there the word 'son' stands for all descendants or it is bahuvrihi according to the rule embodied in Panini 1 2, 84: 'one who has got black hair' shows youth or competency. One who is thus entitled, should consecrate the holy fire, this is the meaning. Even if it is a mandatory text with respect to it, how does proprietary right arise therefrom? He, therefore, gives a reply. 'If by birth', 'alone' is for contrast. 'Born' means by his becoming an equal owner in the property, it becomes common property. He says, 'the estate', 'in the maintenance of the holy fire etc' means the ceremonies to be performed by the husband and wife only: 'etc.' include the donations in the necessary funeral and natal ceremonies.

Mīdāpra.

तथा विभागत्प्राक्पितृप्रसादं लब्धस्य विभागप्रतिषेधोपपद्यते । सर्वानुमत्या वक्तव्याविभागप्राप्तपमावात् । यथाह । शौर्यमार्याधने चोमे यच्च विद्याधनं भवेत् । त्रीप्येतान्यविभाज्यानि प्रसादोपपद्येतुमर्हति । १६ ॥

तथा Tathā, like-wise, विभागत् vibhāgat, separation ; प्राक् prāk, before ; पितृप्रसादं pitṛi-prasāda, through the liberality (प्रसाद) of the father ; लब्धस्य labdhasya, of what is obtained, विभाग-प्रतिषेधः vibhāga-pratīṣedhaḥ, the prohibition of a division . न na, not, उपपद्यते upapadyate, would be pertinent . सर्वानुमत्या sarva-anumatya, by the consent (अनुमति) of all the

parties, दत्तत्वाद् dattatvât because of its being given, विभागप्राप्ति vibhaga-prâpti, of the supposition of partition अभावाद् abhāvât, because of the absence, यथा yathâ, as आह âha, says, शीर्ष-भावा-पत्ने śaurya bhārya dhaue wealth by valour and wealth of a wife, च cha and उभे ubhe, both, यत् yat, which, च cha, again, विद्याधनम् vidyâdhanam, wealth acquired by science, भवेत् bhavet, would be, त्रीणि trini, three, एतानि etāni, there, अविभाज्यानि avibhājyāni, exempt from partition, प्रसादः prasādaḥ, a favour, च यद्, which is, च cha, and, पैतृकः patrīkaḥ, conferred by a father, इति iti, so

19. Likewise the prohibition of a division of that, which is obtained from the liberality of the father previous to separation, would not be pertinent since no partition of it can be supposed, for it has been given by consent of all parties. But Nārada does propound such a prohibition "Excepting what is gained by valour, the wealth of a wife, and what is acquired by science, which are three sorts of property exempt from partition, and any favour conferred by a father."

Balambhatta's gloss

19 If you say that the right in question arises under a text, then by reason of the antecedent prohibition there can be a partition in case of a donation made by favour, it is not so, so he shows the irrelevancy of the prohibition 'Likewise', he says in order to refute the other conflicting reason 'all', in that case under those circumstances by reason of having both the right of making a gift and accepting it and the subsequent failure of the cause, it fails. It is, therefore irrelevant, and the text is like a sky-flower (impossible) Nārada therefore, says, 'so he says' in the wealth acquired by valour and the wife, so also before, therefore (the meaning is) what is obtained by valour according to Brihaspati and the gains of science obtained by valour according to Vyāsa also constitute wealth 'And which', another reading is preferable to 'whose', paternal in the sense coming from the father is derived by adding उक् as an affix under, 'And यद् after पितृ (Panini IV, 3 79)*

Mitākera

तथा । भर्ता प्रीतेन यद्दत्तं स्त्रियै तस्मिन्नुते ऽपि तद् । सा यदाकाममभीवाहया
द्वा स्थापराहतेति प्रीतिदानवचनं नोपपद्यते ॥ तज्जन्मनैव स्वत्ये न च स्थापराहते
यद्दत्तमिति संबन्धोयुक्तोऽव्यवहितयोऽनामकात् । २० ॥

* The suffix means उक् will be added after पितृ and यद् will be added in the sense of coming from there.

तथा tathā so, यथा bhartrā by husband, प्रीत्य prietya, affection-
 ate यद् yad, which दत्तम् dattam, is given, त्रिये striyai, to a wife,
 तस्मिन् tasmīn, on his, मृते mṛite, being deceased, when he is dead, अपि apī,
 नः, नत् tat, that, सा sā, she, यथाकामम् yathākānam, as she pleases,
 अधीयाद् ādhīyāt, may consume—enjoy, दद्याद् dadyāt, may give away,
 वा vā or, स्थावरं sthāvarā, immovable property, ऋते rite, excepting,
 इति iti, this, प्रादान् prādāna, covering an affectionate gift वचनम्
 vacanam, the text; वना, नत् उपपद्यते upapadyate, would be pertinent,
 तद् tad, that, जन्मा janmana, by birth, एव eva, alone, सदे evatve, if
 property were, न na, not, च्चा, and, nor; द्यावरं, sthāvarā, immove-
 able property, ऋते rite, excepting, यद् yad, which, दत्तम् dattam, is
 given, इति iti, so, this, of these terms, संबन्धः sambandha, connection,
 युक्तं yuktah, right, व्यवहितं vyavahita, of disjointed words; योजनं
 construction यत्प्रसङ्गं prasangh, there would be an occasion for .

20. So the text concerning an affectionate gift, (What has been given by an affectionate husband to his wife, she may consume as she pleases, when he is dead, or may give it away, excepting immovable property") would not be pertinent, if property were vested by birth alone. Nor is it right to connect the words, "excepting immovable property" with the terms "what has been given" (in the text last cited), for that would be a forced construction by connection of disjointed terms

Blambhatta's gloss

20 If there is no consent of all, it relates to that subject and there is no fault he then points out another defect 'So' he cites from Vishnu 'by the husband,' he says so by reason of two kinds of gifts, 'affection,' by common etc In that case by reason of the incapacity of the recently born infant in giving consent, although he has proprietary right therein, of the incapacity of one to grant by reason of the property being common and utterly the responsibility of any gift out of affection, the text in support of it is contrary It is the meaning, is it even so when it (prohibition) is connected with the immovable property in the succeeding clause? It is not so there is no conflict of texts but harmony, so he doubts 'And not', being not connected with eating etc and that being not prohibited but being connected with the affectionate gift and the prohibition pertaining to the immovable property, the spirit of law applies there but nowhere else, 'there', by the birth thereof, the proprietary right is laid down it is the meaning 'Disconnected', on connecting them thus, it would be so, but it is not so, by reason of such connection not arising, because of the intervention of the obstruction If it is so, even by reading together the two

different texts unconnected by reason of the prohibition of the gift of the im movable property, the proprietary right arises by birth but not by partition, with this object he doubts

Mistāksarā

यदपि । मणिमुकाप्रवालानां सर्वस्यैव पिता प्रभुः । स्थावरस्य तु सर्वस्य न पिता न पितामहः ॥ तथा । पितृप्रसादान्भुज्यन्ते वस्त्राण्याभरणानि च । स्थावर तु न भुज्येत प्रसादे सति पैतृके इति ॥ स्थावरस्य प्रसादादिह न प्रतिषेधवचनं तत्पितामहो पातिस्त्वावरविषयम् । अतीते पितामहे तद्धनं पितापुत्रयोः साधारणमपि मणिमुकादि पितुरेव । स्थावर तु साधारणमित्यस्मादेव वचनादवगम्यते । २१ ॥

यद् यद्, अपि api, which again, as for, मणि mani, of the gems, मुका muktā of pearls, प्रवालानाम् pravālānām, and of corals, सर्वस्य sarva sya of all, एव eva, indeed, पिता pitā, the father प्रभु prabhu, the owner, स्थावरस्य sthāvarasya, of the immovable property, तु tu, but, सर्वस्य sarvasya, of all, न na, neither, पिता pitā the father, न na nor, पितामह pitāmaha, the grandfather, तथा tathā, similarly, पितृप्रसादाद् pitrī prasādād, through the favour of the father, भुज्यन्ते bhujyante, are enjoyed, वस्त्राणि vastrāṇi, clothes, आभरणानि ābharāṇi ornaments, च cha, and, स्थावरम् sthāvaram, immovable, तु tu, but, न na, not, भुज्येत bhujyate, should be used, प्रसादे prasāde, through the indulgence, सति sati, there would be, पैतृके paitrīke, of the father, इति iti, this, स्थावरस्य sthāvarasya, of regarding immovable property प्रसादाद् prasādād, through favour, इह iha, here, न na, not, प्रतिषेध pratīśadha, of prohibition, वचनम् vachanam, passage, तत् tat, that, पितामह pitāmaha, by the grandfather, उपात्त upāṭta acquired, स्थावर-विषयम् sthāvara viśayam, about immovable property, अतीते atīte, if dead, पितामहे pitāmāhe, the grandfather, तद्धनम् taddhanam, his wealth, पिता पुत्रयो pita-putrāyoh, of the father and son, साधारणम् sādharmaṇam common, अपि api, but, मणि mani, gems, मुकादि muktādi, pearls etc, पितु pituh, belong to the father, एव eva, only, स्थावरम् sthāvaram, the immovable property, तु tu, but, साधारणम् sādharmaṇam, common इति iti, so, this, अस्माद् asmād, from this, एव eva, very, वचनाद् vachanād, passage, अवगम्यते avagam yate, is seen, appears

21. As for the text "The father is master of the gems, pearls, and corals, and of all (other movable property.) but neither the father, nor the grandfather, is so of the whole immovable estate", and this other passage, 'By favour of the father, clothes, and

ornaments are used, but immovable property may not be consumed, even with the father's indulgence"; which passages forbid a gift of immovable property through favour: they both relate to immovables which have descended from the paternal grand-father, when the grand-father dies, his effects become the common property of the father and sons; but it appears from this text alone, that the gem, pearls and other movables belong exclusively to the father, while the immovable estate remains common.

Bālabhāṭṭa's gloss.

21. 'Although'; this means two verses from Nārada: 'of corals' || is in the genitive case for singling them out or for being connected by reason of their being of the same category. Though falling under the same category by reason of the same declension, yet the same text does not apply to them by reason of the contrary application of 'the Vedas are authorities', by the inverted order, *eva* is to be distinguished; no other than the immovable property but the immovable property only. The entire passage has, therefore, a significance; he says by suggesting an implied and additional sense: 'Immovable property'; he suggests the desired unity; 'of all' in the following passage also. 'By the favour of the father, available'; 'on being' even on being; 'in the affectionate gift'. It is in the locative case to indicate a subject, 'prohibitory text'; it is in singular being applicable to a class, similar in the succeeding. When there is 'no ownership in the immovable property, the application of the maxim called 'half an aged woman'* does not apply in the case of the pearls and corals. Therefore, he says 'when the grandfather dies,' so it is under the rule sanctioned by the text, there is nothing wrong in it.

Ālitakṛd.

तस्मात् जन्मना स्वत्वं किंतु स्वामिनाशादिभागाद्वा स्वत्वम् । अतएव पितृकृत्यं विभागात्स्वत्वस्य प्रदीयत्वाद्यन्येन शुद्धमायं न नियतयति इति चोचस्यामयकाशः । तथैकपुत्रस्यापि पितृप्रयाणादेव पुत्रस्य स्वमिति न विभागमपेक्षत इति ॥२२॥

tasmād tasmād, therefore ; न na, not ; जन्मना janmanā, by birth ; स्वत्वम् svaltam, property, किंतु kintu, but ; स्वामि-नाशाद् svāmi-nāśād, after the death of the owner ; विभागाद् vibhāgād, by a partition ; वा vā, or ; स्वत्वम् svaltam, property ; अतः atah, hence ; एव eva, indeed ; पितुः pituḥ,

* The maxim applies when you keep a half of a hen for laying down eggs and the other half for cooking. It is impossible to divide a thing into two, so as to keep one part for one purpose and the other for a different object. The maxim, therefore, means that the text can not be broken into two parts so as to apply to different and contrary objects (See also Jacob's *Lakṣhā Nityānjali*).

the father ; अर्धम् ūrdhvaṃ, after ; विभागम् vibhāgam, the partition ; प्राक् prāk, before ; द्रव्यम् dravyaḥ, of the wealth , स्वत्वस्य svatvasya, of the proprietary right ; मदीयत्वात् prabhinatvāt, because of the loss of ; अन्येन anyena, by some other person, a stranger ; गृहमाप्तम् grihyamānam, being snatched away ; न na, not ; निवार्यते nivāryate, = prevented ; इति iti, so, this ; चोदय चodyasya, for an objection, supposition ; अनवरतः anavakāśaḥ, there is no room for ; तथा tathā, likewise, so , एकपुत्रस्य eka-putrasya, in the case of an only son , अपि api, also , पित्र-प्रयाणात् piti-prayaṇād, by the demise of the father , एव eva, only, just , पुरास्य purasya, of the son ; स्वम् svam, the property ; इति iti, therefore , न na, not ; विभागम् vibhāgam, partition ; अपेक्षते apekṣate, does require , इति iti, so.

22. Therefore property is not by birth, but by demise of the owner, or by partition. Accordingly (since the demise of the owner is a cause of property) there is no room for supposing, that a stranger could not be prevented from taking the effects because the property was vacant, after the death of the father before partition. So likewise, in the case of an only son, the estate becomes the property of the son by the father's decease, and does not require partition.

Balambhatta's gloss.

22 He concludes the purvakṣa (opponent's view), 'therefore' it means this. By acquisition, the property belongs to the acquirer, then it passes to his relatives or sons by partition or on demise of the owner. When the owner is alive, the partition is the cause of the proprietary right

When the proprietor is dead, his death is the cause of the proprietary right. There is another peculiar feature, when the owner's relative, son or grandson is single and the owner is divided or single there is the cause of the uncommon proprietary right on the death of the owner but when they are many, the property becomes common (of all) on the death of the owner but separate on partition. In this state of the owner on the demise of the grandfather by reason of the absence of the separate property of the father before partition in the grandfather's property, one should not make a gift of the ancestral property out of affection. This prohibition relates to the gift of such immovable, but not to the self acquired property by reason of the proprietary right arising by birth. Because the death of the owner is also a cause of the proprietary right, therefore on the death of the father before partition, like the property of a stranger, being an object of indifference does not become property, so he says, 'accordingly', means by accepting the death of the father : 'vacant' means in

the absence of the owner asserting the right. Having explained its necessity in the case of many sons he shows the necessity thereof in the case of one son ; 'so likewise' means like it; by 'decease' means by death the sentence means that the property of such prepositus who has got only one son, becomes vested in the son on his death only, but does not stand in need of partition. Only (eva) is in antithesis with 'not', (does not require).

Mītakṣara

अत्रोच्यते । लोकप्रसिद्धमेव स्वत्वमित्युक्तम् ॥ लोके च पुत्रादीनां जन्मतैव स्वात्वं प्रसिद्धतरं नापह्नवमर्हति । विभागशब्दश्च बहुस्वामिकधनविषयालोकप्रसिद्धो नान्यदीपविषयो न ग्रहीणविषयः । तं तपोपत्यैवार्थस्योक्तिः 'समेतेत्याचार्येति' गौतमं पञ्चनाच्च । २३ ॥

अत्र atra, here, as regards this ; उच्यते uchyate, it is said ; लोकप्रसिद्धम् lokaprasiddham, a matter of popular recognition ; एव eva, indeed ; स्वात्वं svatvam, property ; इति iti, so ; उक्तम् uktam, it is said ; लोके loka, in the world ; च cha, and ; पुत्रादीनाम् putradīnām, of a son etc. ; जन्मतः janmatā, by birth ; एव eva, indeed ; स्वत्वम् svatvam, property ; प्रसिद्धतरम् prasiddhataram, better known ; न na, not ; अपह्नवम् apahnavam, denial, contradiction ; अर्हति arhati, deserves ; विभागशब्दः vibhāga śabdah, the word partition ; च cha, and ; बहु-स्वामिकः bahu evāmika, such as may have many owners ; धन-विषयः dhana-viṣayah, about such wealth as etc लोक-प्रसिद्धः loka-prasiddhah, very familiar to the world ; न na, not ; अन्यदीप-विषयः anyadīya-viṣayah, pertaining to that which relates to another ; न nā, nor ; ग्रहीण-विषयः grāhīṇa-viṣayah, appertaining to vacant property ; तम् tam, him ; तथा tathā, so ; उपत्यया utpatyā, by birth ; अर्थ-स्वामित्वम्, artha-svāmītvam, ownership of wealth ; एव eva, indeed ; समेते lābheta, may reach or may be taken ; इति iti, so, direct, आचार्यः āchāryah, the venerable teachers ; इति iti, so ; गौतमपञ्चनाच्च Gautama-vachanāt, from the text of Gautama ; च cha, and.

23. To this the answer is : It has been shown, that property is a matter of popular recognition ; and the right of sons and the rest, by birth, is most familiar, to the world, as cannot be denied ; but the term partition is generally understood to relate to effects belonging to several owners and does not relate to that which appertains to another, nor to goods vacant, or unowned. For the text of Gautama expresses, "Let ownership of wealth be taken by birth; as the venerable teachers direct."

Balambhāṭṭa's gloss

23 Having thus explained the *purvapakṣa* view (of the opponent) he sets forth the *siddhānta* (established) view 'To this the answer is etc.' he reiterates the same here to suggest the the reason of the previous established truth 'Amagat po, le' he means that it is so recognised by the people 'and popular recognition' shows the necessity of the reality of the excellence on accepting it. N: denial', he gives another reason 'partition' has already been explained previously, 'unowned' ('vacant') not also without wealth 'is generally accepted,' is to be repeated. He cites Gautama's text in support of it, similarly by birth 'similarity' is to denote conjunction, the meaning is that the teachers hold that the property should be taken by one by reason of the proprietary right in the inheritance from one's birth there is another reading 'by reason of there being no owner' but there is another reading 'the ownership of the property' which often occurs and is preferable and 'under the text' (*vachanāt*) is an incorrect reading.

Mistakera

मणिमुक्तामयालानामित्यादि वचनं च जन्मना स्वत्वपक्षयोपपद्यते । न च पितामहोपास्रधावदधिपमिति युक्तम् । न पिता न पितामह इति वचनात् । पितामहस्य हि स्वार्जितमपि पुत्रे पीत्रे च स्वत्वदेयमिति वचनं जन्मना स्वत्वं गमयति । तथा परमते मणिमुक्तावलाभत्वादीनां पितामहानामपि वितुरेव स्वत्वं वचनात् । पक्षमस्मन्मतेऽपि विश्वार्जितानामप्येतेर्वापितुर्दानाधिकारो वचनादित्यवश्येयः । २४ ॥

मणि *mani*, of gems मुक्ता *muktā*, of pearls, मयादानान् *pravalāṇām*, and of corals इत्यादि *iti ādi*, this and the following, वचनम् *vachanam*, text च *cha*, again, जन्मना *janmanā* being vested by birth, स्वत्वपक्षे *svatva pakshe*, on the supposition of proprietary right, एव *eva*, only, उपपद्यते *upapadyate*, is pertinent, न *na*, not, च *cha* and, पितामह *pitāmaha*, by the grandfather, उपार्जितम् *upārjita*, acquired, स्वावर विधयम् *atī āvara viśayam*, concerning the immovable property, इति *iti*, this, युक्तम् *yuktam* is right, न *na*, not, neither, पिता *pitā*, the father, न *no*, not, पितामह *pitāmaha*, the grandfather, इति *iti*, this वचनात् *vachanāt*, from this text, पितामहस्य *pitāmahasya*, the grand father's, हि *hi*, because, एव जितम् *evārjita* own acquisition, अपि *api* also, पुत्रे *putre*, the son, पीत्रे *pitre*, the grand son, च *cha* and, सति *sati* being alive, present, living, अदेयम् *adeyam*, is not to be given, इति *iti*, thus वचनम् *vachanam*, maxim, जन्मना *janmanā*, by birth, स्वत्वम् *svatvam*, a proprietary interest, गमयति *gamayati*, indicates, तथा *tathā*, as, परमते *para mate*, according to the other opinion, मणि *mani*, the gems, मुक्ता *muktā*,

pearls ; वस्त्र *vastra*, clothes ; आभरणादीनाम् *Abharaṇādīnām*, ornaments and other effects ; पैतृगृहानाम् *paitṛgṛhānām*, belonging to the grandfather and inherited from him , अपि *api*, though ; पितुः *pituh*, are the father's ; स्वयम् *svayam*, property ; वचनात् *vachanāt* under special provisions of the law ; एवम् *evam* ; thus ; अस्मत्पते *asmat-pate*, according to our opinion ; अपि *api*, also ; पित्रा *pitṛā*, by his father ; अर्जितम् *arjitam*, acquired ; अपि *api*, though , एतेषाम् *eteṣām*, these ; पितुः *pituh*, the father's ; दान-अधिकारः *dāna-adhikārah*, the right to give ; वचनात् *vachanāt*, these being an authority of a text , इति *iti*, these words , अविशेषः *aviśeṣah*, are (of course) common.

21. Moreover, the text above cited, "The father is master of the gems, pearls, &c." (§21) is pertinent on the supposition of a proprietary right vested by birth. Nor is it right to affirm, that it relates to immovables which have descended from the paternal grandfather : since the text expresses "neither the father, nor the grandfather." The maxim, that the grandfather's own acquisition should not be given away while a son or grandson is living, indicates a proprietary interest by birth. As, according to the other opinion, the precious stones, pearls, clothes, ornaments, and other effects, though inherited from the grandfather, belong to the father under the special provisions of the law ; so, according to our opinion, the father has power, under the same text, to give away such effects, though acquired by his father. There is no difference

Balambhatta's gloss.

24 (He says that the passage) 'gems, pearls etc.' fits in with the established truth (śiḍhanta view). 'gem', by 'etc.' is meant an acceptance of a gift arising from the text. Having thus accomplished the object, he exposes the perverseness 'of the critic's statement. 'Nor the grandfather,' he gives a reason to show its inappropriateness. 'Neither father', the meaning is that by the accrual of the proprietary right with the death of the propositus, even on the jointness of the father and son on the death of the grandfather in his property, the gems etc. under the text belong to the father alone but the immovable property is common. If the previously said meaning is clear from the text, the provisionally laid down rule is applicable. It is not so, if the immovable property is acquired by the grandfather, then during his life time in the self-acquisitions, there is no applicability of the fourth passage (gift without acceptance) to suggest the want of ownership. It may be, therefore, said that the statement is the effect that the immovable property is the

common property of all, is not appropriate and does not relate to it. To what subject do these two texts apply, so that they may be relevant under the present discussion? He replies, 'the grandfathers', 'As means because, the maxim refers to two texts it means that both the texts point to the proprietary right arising with the birth

How can there be an affectionate gift of the gems and pearls, if there is common proprietary right with the birth alone? On this question being raised, out of deference he replies, 'as', 'other', means the objector, he says with that object 'garment' 'According to our opinion' means in the established truth also (siddhānta view) there is another reading 'self acquired' instead of 'acquired by his father' He means that in the same way a father is competent to make a gift of self-acquired chattels with the exception of the immovable property even without the validating consent

Middhara

यत्तु भर्त्रा प्रीतेनेत्यादिपिपुत्रवचनं स्वावरस्य प्रीतदानकामेन तत्स्योपार्जितस्यापि पुत्राद्यभ्यनुज्ञयैवेति व्याख्येयम् । पूर्वोक्तैर्मणिमुक्तादिवचने. स्वावरस्यतिरिक्तस्यैव प्रीतदानयोग्यत्वनिश्चयात् ॥ २५ ॥

यत् yat, that, तु tu but, again, भर्त्रा bhartrā, by the husband, प्रीतेन prītena, by the pleased one or affectionate one, इति आदि iti ādi, these and the other, दिपुत्रवचनम् viśṇu vachanam words of Viśṇu, स्वावरस्य sthāvarasya, of an immovable property, प्रीतिदानं prīti dāna, an affectionate gift, ज्ञापनमुद्गापनम् jñāpanam, indicating, अत् tat, that, एव उपार्जितस्य eva upārjitasya, of what is his own acquisition, अपि api, though, पुत्रादि putrādi, of sons and others, अभ्यनुज्ञया abhyanuñjaya, with the consent, or permission, एव eva, only, इति iti, so, व्याख्येयम् vyākhyeyam, to be interpreted, पूर्वोक्तैः pūrvoktaiḥ, by what are cited above, मणि manī, gems, मुक्तादि muktādi, pearls etc., वचनैः vachanaiḥ, by the passages, स्वावरस्यतिरिक्तस्य sthāvara vyatiriktasya, of what is other than immovables, एवम् evam, thus, प्रीतिदानं prīti dāna, for making an affectionate gift योग्यात् योग्यात्वा of fitness, निश्चयात् niśchayāt, because of the certainty of

25. But the text of Vishnu's (§20), which mentions a gift of immovables bestowed through affection, must be interpreted as relating to property acquired by the father himself and given with the consent of his son and the rest: for, by the passage (above cited, as well as others not quoted, viz) "The father is master of the gems, pearls, &c., the fitness of any other but immovables for an affectionate gift was certain

Balambhatta's gloss.

25 Is not the text of Viṣṇu similarly against the affectionate gift of the immovable property? He, therefore, replies 'as to...by the husband'; it refers to the gift made by the husband in favour of his wife 'suggesting' (jñā,anam) is from ह्युत् in the instrumental sense and is used for suggester' (jñā,paka): at mun; places the same reading occurs 'That acquired by himself' means that there is no right of making a gift even of the self acquired immovable property without the consent of the capable members but in other cases it does not stand in need of it. So in the immovable property gifted by the husband, (the wife) can live till her life without making a gift or sale without necessity. Here by using 'husband', it shows the absolute estate in a gift made by the father-in-law. Therefore, Bṛhaspati says "whatever immovable and other properties are given to a female by her father-in-law, can not be resumed even, by the sons under any circumstance." He assigns a reason to show the appropriateness of Viṣṇu's text. 'above-cited' from the plural 'the quoted texts' should be understood, it will be clear subsequently: 'by the passages' is in the 3rd form of declension 'being an instrumental case. There is, therefore, no non-applicability, of the compound (samāsa) by reason of the certainty of ān as.

Mitākṣara

यद्यप्यर्थसाधयेषु वैदिकेषु कर्मस्वनधिकार इति तत्र तद्विधानबलादेवाधिकारो गम्यते । २६ ॥

यद् यद्, which; अरि api, again, as for, अर्थ-साधयेषु; artha sādhyeṣu, that can be accomplished by the use of wealth, वैदिकेषु vaidikeṣu, that are prescribed by the Vedas; कर्मसु karmasu, for the religious duties (that etc.), अनधिकारः anadhikārah, inability; इति-iti, so; तत्र tatra, as regards these rites; तद-विधान-बलाद् tad-vidhāna balād, from the cogency of the precept which enjoins their performance, एव eva, indeed) अधिकारः adhikārah, sufficient power, गम्यते gamyate, is inferred,

26. As for the alleged disqualification for religious duties which are presented by the Veda, and which require for their accomplishment the use of wealth (§18) sufficient power for such purposes is inferred from the cogency of the precept (which enjoins their performance).

Balambhatta's gloss

26. He refutes the first argument; he means that there is an authority conferred under the text.

Mīlaksarā

तस्मात्पैतृके पैतामहे च द्रव्ये जन्मैवस्वत्वम् । तथापि पितुरावश्यकेषु धर्म-
कृत्येषु धाचनिकेषु प्रसाददानकुटुम्बपरिपोषादिषु च स्वावरव्यतिरिक्तद्रव्यविनि-
योगे स्वातन्त्र्यमिति स्थितम् । स्वावरे तु स्वार्जिते पित्रादिप्राप्ते च पुत्रादिपारतन्त्र्यमेव ।
स्वावर द्विपदं चैव यद्यपि स्वयमर्जितम् । असंभूय सुतान्सर्वान् दानं न च विक्रयः ॥
ये जाता येऽप्यजाताश्च ये च गर्भे व्यवस्थिताः । वृत्तिं च तैः सकाङ्क्षन्ति न दानं न च
विक्रय इत्यादिस्मरणात् । २७ ॥

तस्मात् tasmād, therefore, पैतृके patrīke, in the paternal, पैतामहे
patāmāhe, in the ancestral; च cha, and, द्रव्ये dravye, (in the) estate,
जन्मना jannanā, by birth, एव eva, indeed, स्वत्वम् svatvam, property,
तदपि tatāpi yet, पितु pituh of the father, the father has, आवरव्यकेषु
āvavayakesu, for indispensable, necessary, धर्मकृत्येषु dharmakṛtyeṣu,
acts of duty, धाचनिकेषु dhāchanikeṣu for purposes prescribed by texts of
law, प्रसाददान prasād dāna, gifts of affection पुटुम्बपरिपोषादिषु
śūṭumbhāraṇādīṣu, support of the family, आरतिभोगादिषु āratibhogaḍīṣu, relief from dis-
tress and so forth, च cha, and, दानं dāna, दानं दानं sthāvara vyatikṛta, other
than immovable, द्रव्य dravya, of effects, विनियोगे viniyoge, in the dis-
posal, स्वतन्त्र्यम् svātantryam, independence, इति iti, so, this, स्थितम्,
sthitam, a settled point, दानं sthāvara, in regard to the immovable
estate, तु in, but, स्वार्जिते svārjite, acquired by himself, पित्रादिप्राप्ते
pitṛādi-prāpte inherited from his father, etc च cha, and पुत्रादि पुत्रादि,
of his sons and the rest, पारतन्त्र्यम् pārtantryam, control, dependence on
(his sons etc), एव eva, indeed, स्वावरम् sthāvatam, immovables, द्विपदम्
dvīpadam, bipeds, च cha, and, एव eva, indeed, यद्यपि, yad-āpi,
though, स्वयम् svayam, by himself; अर्जितम् arjitam, acquired, असंभूय
asambhūya, without convening सुतान् sutān, sons सर्वान् sarvān, all, न na,
neither, दानम् dānam, a gift, न च na cha, nor, विक्रय विक्रयः vikrayaḥ a sale,
ये ye, who, जाता jātāḥ, are born, ये ye, who, अपि api, again, जाता
ye ye, who, च cha, again, गर्भे garbhe, in the womb व्यवस्थिताः vyasthitāḥ,
are resting, settled fixed, ल्यङ् lyang, वृत्तिम् vṛttim, means of support,
च cha, and, ते to, they; अभिकान्ति अभिकान्ति abhikānti, require, न no, no,
दानम् dānam, gift, न च na cha, nor विक्रय विक्रयः vikrayaḥ, any sale (should be
made), इत्यादि ityādi, such and such आरणात् sma nāt, since has been
ordained

27. Therefore it is a settled point, that property in the
paternal or ancestral estate is by birth, (although) the father

have independent power in the disposal of effects other than immovables, for indispensable acts of duty and for purposes prescribed by texts of law, as gifts through affection, support of the family, relief from distress, and so forth but he is subject to the control of his sons and the rest, in regard to the immovable estate, whether acquired by himself or inherited from his father or other predecessor, since it is ordained "Though immovables or bipeds have been acquired by a man himself, gift or sale of them should not be made without convening all the sons. They, who are born, and they who are yet unbegotten, and they who are still in the womb, require the means of support, no gift or sale should, therefore, be made."

Balambhatta's gloss

27 He then makes a particular conclusion, 'therefore', it is connected with 'settled' (sthāva), 'although' is understood 'Of the father' is connected with 'independence', he cites the necessary smṛiti passages 'For indispensable acts' he assigns reason in the existence of necessity, 'as prescribed in texts of law' means in the funeral ceremonies it is a part of the succeeding passage 'Immoveable property', he is independent in disposing of the other kind of property

Having said elsewhere about immoveable property, he now expresses the established truth 'immoveable property', 'but' in contrast 'control' (dependence) of the father, he says that even on reading its meaning as a whole in conformity with reason, the text is an exception 'Immoveable property', bipeds, slaves etc, 'self even by self, earned, 'although his' is understood 'Without convening', without asking, 'the son' includes daughter 'therefore all' is an *okāṣa* (dvandva) compounds explained previously. Not only these but others also, 'those who are born' 'unborn' those who will be born 'require', 'because', 'therefore' are understood.

Mistake

अस्यापवाद । एकोपि स्थावरे कुर्यादनाधमनविक्रयम् । आपत्काले ब्रुमुम्यर्थे धर्मायै च विशेषत इति । २८ ॥

अस्य asya, to this अपवाद apavādaḥ, an exception, एक okāṣa, a single, अपि api, even स्थावर sthāvara, of an immovable property, कुर्यात् kuryāt, should conclude, दातु dātu donation, अधमन adhamana a mortgage विक्रयम् vikrayam or sale आपत्काले āpatkāle, during a season

of distress, कुटुम्बार्थे katumbārthe, for the sake of the family, धनार्थे dharmārthe, for pious purposes, विशेषतः viśeṣataḥ, especially, इति itī, au

28. An exception to it follows "Even a single individual may conclude a donation, mortgage, or sale of immovable property, during a season of distress, for the sake of the family, and especially for pious purposes."

Balambhatta's gloss

28 'Its' means the exception by the special text to the above said general rule in the immovable property, it is in the locative case in the sense of subject, 'mortgage' means hypothecation. It is a compound called 'dwanda by collection'. He gives a special reason 'distress', he says in order to accomplish the object only.

Mitaksara

अस्यार्थः । अग्राह्यवहारेषु पुत्रेषु पीत्रेषु वा अनुज्ञादानादायलनयेऽनुज्ञादेषु वा तथाविधेष्वभिमतैः सः सकलकुटुम्बस्यापि सः यदि तत्परोक्षे चादृशकर्मव्येषु पितृभ्रात्रादियुः स्यादस्य दानाधमनयिकयमेकोपि समर्थः कुर्यादिति । २६ ॥

अस्य asya, of this, अर्थः arthah, the meaning, अग्राह्यवहारेषु aprāpta vyavahāreṣu, minor such as are not capable of dealing in business पुत्रेषु putreṣu, if the sons are पीत्रेषु pātreṣu, if the grandsons are (so), वा vā, or, अनुज्ञा दानादी annjñā dānādau, of giving consent असमर्थेषु asamartheṣu, incapable of, आदृषु bhātr̥eṣu, if the brothers be, वा vā, or, तथाविधेषु tathāvidheṣu, being so अवभिक्त्युः avibhakteṣu, continue unseparated, अत्र api, even, though, सकल कुटुम्बस्यापि sakal-kutumba vyā pinyām, affecting the whole family, आपदि śpad ī a calamity, तत्परोक्षे tat pōkṣe, in supporting it, वा vā, or, आदृशकर्मव्येषु ādṛśyam kartavyeṣu, in the matter of indispensable duties पितृ भ्रात्रादियुः pitṛ bhātrādīdigu, such as the obsequies of the father or the like स्वधरस्य sthāvarasya, of the immovable property, दान dana, gift, अधमन adhamana, hypothecation, विक्रयम् vikrayam, or sale एक ekah single, अपि api though, समर्थः samarthah, who is capable, कुर्यात् kuryāt, may conclude, इति itī, such is the meaning.

29 The meaning of that text is this: while the sons and grandsons are minors, and incapable of giving the consent to a

gift and the like, or while brothers are so, and continue unseparated, even one person, who is capable, may conclude a gift, hypothecation, or sale of immovable property, if a calamity affecting the whole family require it, or the support of the family render it necessary, or indispensable duties, such as the obsequies of the family render it necessary, or indispensable duties, such as the obsequies of the father or the like make it unavoidable.

Balambhatta's gloss.

20 Its meaning, 'in giving their consent' shows the manner of what is to be said on their being capable and is not in conflict, further it shows the consultation of both: by 'api' (also) is meant the reunited; 'sapekṣa' is understood everywhere, even then he mentions it specially; 'whole', 'it' ('at) means the entire family, he gives the result by the locative case in the sense of subject. 'Of the immovable property'; 'may conclude', therefore though unity is obtained, he reiterates the unity of purpose: 'capable.'

Mitākṣara.

यत्तु यत्नम् । अविभक्ता विभक्ता वा सपिण्डाः साधरे समाः । एकोहानीयः सर्वत्र दानाद्यमनविक्रय इति तदप्यविभक्तेषु द्रव्यस्य मध्यस्वत्वादिकस्यानीश्वरत्वात् सर्वाभ्युदायकार्या । विभक्तेषु उत्तरकालं विभक्ताविभक्तसंशयव्युदासेन व्युदासीकर्याप्य सर्वत्र युक्तं न पुनरेकस्यानीश्वरत्वे नातो विभक्तानुमतिव्यतिरेकेणापि व्यवहारः सिद्धपक्षेयेति व्याख्येयम् ॥ ३० ॥

यत् तु yat tu, but that; यत्नम् vachanam, the text, passage; अविभक्ता avibhaktāḥ, not separated, विभक्ता vibhaktāḥ, separated; वा vā, or; सपिण्डाः sapindāḥ, kinsmen, साधरे āthāre, in respect of unmovables; समाः samāḥ, equal, एकः ekah, one, हि hi, for; अनीयः anīyāḥ, powerless, having no right, सर्वत्र saratra, over the whole, दान dāna, to make a gift अमन अधमान, to mortgage, विक्रये vikraye, and to sell, इति iti, so, this; तत् tat, that; अपि api, also, अविभक्तेषु avibhakteṣu, among unseparated; द्रव्यस्य dravyasya, of the estate, मध्यस्वत्वाद् madhya āthavād, because of the common nature of, एतरेkasya, of one single person; अनीश्वरत्वाद् anīśvratvād, because of the powerlessness, सर्वत्र व्युदासेन sarvābhyānujād, the consent of all, वाच्यम् vacyam, surely, कार्या kāryā, should or must be taken, विभक्तेषु vibhakteṣu, among separated ones; उत्तरकालम् uttarakālam, in future time, विभक्त vibhakta whether separate; अविभक्त avibhakta, or unseparated, or united, संशय samśaya, the doubt, व्युदासेन vyudāsena,

by obviating, व्यवहार vyavahāra, the transaction, सौकर्याय saukaryāya, to facilitate, सर्वसन्तुष्टा sarvābhyānūjñā the consent of all न na, not, पुन punah, again, एकस्य ekaśya, in a single person, अनिवार्यत्वे anivartye, on account of any want of sufficient power न na not without अत atah, consequently विभक्तः vibhakta, of separate kinship, अनुमति anumatī, consent, व्यतिकरेण vyatikāreṇa, mixing up, taking up, अपि api even, व्यवहार vyavahārah, transaction, सिद्धयति siddhyati, becomes valid एवं eva, indeed, इति iti, so, thus, व्याख्येयम् vyākhyeyam, must be interpreted

30 The following passage, "Separated kinsmen, as those who are unseparated, are equal in respect of immovables, for one has not power over the whole, to make a gift, sale, or mortgage," must be thus interpreted: "among unseparated kinsmen, the consent of all is indispensably requisite because no one is fully empowered to make an alienation, since the estate is in common" but, among separated kindred, the consent of all tends to the facility of the transaction, by obviating any future doubt, whether they be separate or united, it is not required, on account of any want of sufficient power, in the single owner, and the transaction is consequently valid even without the consent of separated kinsmen

Balambhatta's gloss

30 He reconciles the contradiction which arises from the text with Manu's text with the above said object. As to the text of Manu, 'kinsmen' (sapinda) implies 'propinquity' 'for', means because, 'over the whole', qualifies the donations etc. 'Although' is connected with 'must be thus interpreted', 'also' means thus the above said collection of texts of Vishnu, he therefore, explains it in an inverted order. By reason of being in the middle 'means by being common by reason of being not capable', to both 'ka' is added = the sense of one's object in their stead there are मयस्य-वस्य and अनिवार्यत्वे the different readings. 'All', means that without the consent of the co-sharers (who are not separate) there can not be donation etc. 'For the facility of the transaction' means 'of the donee etc.', 'not again' on the contrary not he then sums up, 'consequently' So that is a subject of the consent of those who are not competent, this is the subject of the consent of those who are competent. So there can not be donation etc. and without the consent of those co-sharers who are competent it means that they depend upon it (consent). On the other hand, though the gift is proper without the consent of the separated ones who are competent, yet for the facility of the transactions for the donee etc., they depend upon it (consent) it is its subject it does not prohibit the gift etc. in all cases. (The text) 'even a single' is an excep

tion to it so there is no contradiction. But Malana (Madan Pārījāta) says 'it prohibits the donation etc. of the standing crops grown in the undivided fields of even those who are divided in a portion of the property, without the consent' "

Mitākṣarā

यदपि । स्वग्रामशतिग्रामसदाशानुमतेन च । हिरण्योदकदानेन पञ्चगोष्ठ्यति मेदिनीति । तथापि ग्रामानुमतिः प्रतिग्रहः प्रकाशः स्वात्स्यात्स्व विवेकदशनि स्वरूपः व्यवहारप्रकाशनार्थमेवापेक्षते न पुनर्ग्रामानुमत्या विना व्यवहारसिद्धिः । सामान्तानुमतिस्तु सोमाप्रतिपत्तिरित्यस्य । शतिदायादानुमतेस्तु प्रयोजनमुक्तमेव । ३१ ॥

यद् यद्, that (passaḥ), अपि api, again, also, ग्रामाः grāma, of his townsmen, शानि jñāti, kinsmen, सामन्त सौमन्ता, neighbours, दायाद dāyāda, heirs, अनुमतेन anumateṇa, by the consent, च cha, and, हिरण्य hiranya, of gold उदक udaka, and water, दानेन dāneṇa, by a gift, पञ्चि panchi, by six (formalities), गच्छति gachchati, passes, मेदिनी medinī, land, इति iti, so, अतित्रा, in that, तथा api, also, ग्रामानुमति grāma, anumatiḥ, the consent of the townsmen, प्रतिग्रहः pratigrahaḥ, acceptance, प्रकाश prakāśaḥ, public, known to the people, स्वात् syat, should be, स्वात्स्व sthāvārasya, that of an immovable property; विशेषतः viśeṣataḥ, especially, इति iti, such, this, स्मरन्तः smarant, since it has been provided; व्यवहार vyavahāra, of the transaction, प्रकाशनार्थम् prakāśanārtham, for the sake of the publicity of, एव eva, only, अपेक्षते apakṣyate, is required; न na, not, पुन पुनāh, and ग्रामानुमत्या grāma anumatyā, the consent of the townsmen, विना vinā, without, व्यवहार vyavahāra, of the transaction, असिद्धिḥ asiddhiḥ, the invalidity सामान्तानुमति Sāmantānumatiḥ, the consent of the neighbours, तु tu, but, सीमा śīmā, about the boundary, प्रतिपत्तिḥ pratipattiḥ, dis, into, doubt, निरासः nirāsaḥ, a, to remove, शानि jñāti, of the kinsmen, दायाद dāyāda, of the kinsmen, अनुमते anumateḥ, of the consent of, तु tu, but; प्रयोजनम् prayojanam, the purpose, the use, उक्तम् uktam, is mentioned, एव eva, already

31 In the texts, which expresses, that "Land passes by six formalities, by consent of townsmen, of kinsmen, of neighbours, and of heirs and by gift of gold and of water, consent of townsmen is required for the publicity of the transaction, since it is provided; that "Acceptance of a gift, especially of land, should be public" but the contract is not invalid without the consent. The approbation of neighbours serves to obviate any dispute con-

cerning the boundary. The use of the consent of kinsmen and of heirs has been explained.

Bālamihalla's gloss

31 He now reconciles the contradiction with the text of Manu, 'in that text, own' (eva) is an adjective of all for a clear meaning by reason of obtaining proximity. On account of hearing it at the end of the danda compound, the 'consent should be repeated every where, the affix 'kta' is added in the sense of 'existence' and should be connected with the followings = with the six. Having explained it and shown the applicability in order, he gives the result following the consent of townsmen at first 'there the consent of the townsmen', he cites Manu, 'acceptance of gift, 'not again' means 'but not', 'consent of kinsman', the singular is in the sense of a class 'has been explained' means with the object of the facility of the transaction

Mistakeard

हिरण्योदकदानेनेति । स्वायरे विक्रयानास्ति कुर्यादाधिमनुश्चेति साधरस्य विक्रयप्रतिषेधात् । भूमिः सः प्रतिगृह्णाति यत्रभूमिः प्रयच्छति । उभौ तौ पुण्यकर्माणौ नियतौ स्वर्गगामिनाविति दानप्रशसादर्शनाच्च । विक्रयेऽपि कर्तव्ये सहिरण्यमुदकं दत्त्वा दानरूपेण साधरस्यैव कुर्यादित्यर्थः ॥ ३२ ॥

हिरण्यं hiraṇya, of gold, उदकं udaka, and of water, दानेन dānena by the gift, इति iti, this provision, स्वायरे athāvare, as regards an immovable property, विक्रयः vikrayah, sale, न na, not, अस्ति asti, there is, कुर्याद् kuryād, may execute; आधिम् ādhim, a mortgage, अनुज्ञाय अनुज्ञाय, by the consent, इति iti, by this statement; विक्रयप्रतिषेधः vikraya pratiśedhāt, because of the prohibition to the sale, भूमिम् bhūmim, land, यः yah, he who, प्रतिगृह्णाति prati gṛhṇāti, accepts य yah, he who, च cha, and, भूमिम् bhūmim, land, प्रयच्छति prayacchhati gives; उभौ ubhau, both, तौ tau, those, पुण्यकर्माणौ puṇyakarmanau, performers of a holy deed, नियतौ niyatau, are sure, are destined, स्वर्गगामिनौ svaṛga gāminau, to go to heaven, the region of bliss, इति iti, thus, दानं dāna, or gift, प्रशंसा prasansā, the praise, दर्शनात् darśanāt, since it is seen, च cha, and, विक्रये vikraye, if a sale, कर्तव्ये kartavye, must be made, सहिरण्यम् sahiranyam, with gold; उदकम् udakam, water दत्त्वा datva, by giving, दानरूपेण dāna-rūpeṇa, in the form of a gift, एव eva, of an immovable property, विक्रयम् vikrayam, the sale, कुर्यात् kuryat, should do. इति iti, thus, अर्थः arthah, the meaning

32. (By gift of gold and of water) Since the sale of immovables is forbidden ("In regard to the immovables *atē*, sale is not allowed," it may be mortgaged by consent of parties interested, and since donation is praised, "Both he who accepts land, and he who gives it, are performers of a holy deed, and shall go to a region of bliss") if a sale must be made, it should be conducted, for the transfer of immovable property, in the form of a gift, delivering with it gold and water (to ratify the donation).

Balambhatta's gloss.

32. In order to explain the extraordinary use of gold and water he says with an authority; 'gold'; in a case of a gift, their being essential (to validate) the gift, is it improper in the case of a sale by reason of the necessity of the transfer also there, on account of their absence? Therefore he says, both these have, like *Manu*, authority, as before; by 'api' gift is meant.

Mitākṣra.

पैतृके पैतामहे च धने जन्मनैव स्वत्वेऽपि विशेषं भूयां पितामहोपासेत्यत्र
वक्ष्यामः । ३३ ॥

पैतृके *patrike*, to the paternal; पैतामहे *pitāmahe*, the ancestral; *cha*, and; धने *dhane*, estate, जन्मना *janmanā*, by birth; स्वत्वे *svatre*, only, surely; स्वत्वे *svatre*, though the proprietary right is; अपि *api*, though; विशेषम् *viśeṣam*, the distinction; भूः *bhūḥ*, land; या *yā*, that, पितामहोपासा *pitāmahe upāṭṭa*, what is acquired by the grandfather; इति *iti*, that; अत्र *atra*, here; वक्ष्यामः *vakṣyāmah*, we shall explain;

33. In respect of the right by birth, to the estate paternal or ancestral, we shall mention a distinction under a subsequent text,

Balambhatta's gloss

Having said generally as regards immovable property he now says in particular with reference to both. 'Paternal' by this, the death of the father is the cause of the proprietary right ['on the death of the father, let the sons divide the father's property' *Narada* chap XIII.2.] but not birth ['after the father and mother' (*Manu* IX-104.)]

"On the death of the father let the sons divide the father's wealth; when the faultless father is alive, they have no ownership." It is in conflict with *Devala*. It shows dependence like 'wife and son.....' (*M. VIII-41* *Gharyu* ed. in.). Then there is no proof of proprietary right, in wife and others from 'whatever they earn' (*Manu* VIII-47) the proprietary right being proved, it is improper to say that it relates

to their dependence, because of the conflict with the text of the Veda by reason of the failure of the Vedic rite to be performed with their own wealth on their having no proprietary right in their own earning. This being so, there can be a partition even against the will of the father. There being no authority in favour of the proprietary right by birth and the smṛiti having not ordained earning from birth, therefore it is with a view to prohibit partition while the father is alive, the text of Manu does not lay down independence of proprietary right, but (shows) that there is no ownership while the parents are alive. The above said (proposition) that the ownership arises on death, degradation etc. is refuted for the above reasons.

END OF PREFACE



SECTION II. 1.

Mitākṛd.

इदानीं यत्र काले येन च यथा विभागः कर्तव्यस्तदर्थोऽब्राह्म
विभागं चेत्पिता कुर्यादिच्छया विभजेत्सुतान् ।
ज्येष्ठम् वा श्रेष्ठभागेन सर्वं वा स्युः समांशिनः ॥ ११४ ॥

इदानीम् idānim, next, now; यत्र yatra, at what; काले kāle, time; येन yena, by whom, च cha, and; यथा yathā how, विभागः vibhāgaḥ, partition; कर्तव्यः kartavyaḥ, may be made; तद् tad, that, those points; दशोऽर्थे darśanā, explaining. आह āha, the author says; विभागम् vibhāgam, partition; चेत् chet, if; पिता pitā, the father; कुर्यात् kuryāt, may make; इच्छया icchhayā, at his pleasure; विभजेत् vibhajet, may separate; सुताम् sūtām, sons; ज्येष्ठम् jyeṣṭham, the eldest; वा vā, either; श्रेष्ठभागेन śreṣṭhā-bhāgena, by the best share, सर्वं sarva, all; वा vā, or, स्युः syuḥ, may be; समांशिनः samānśinaḥ, equal sharers.

1. . At what time, by whom, and how, partition may be made, will be next considered. Explaining those points, the author says, "when the father makes a partition, let him separate his sons (from himself) at his pleasure, and either (dismiss) the eldest with the best share, or (if he choose) all may be equal sharers."

Balambhatta's gloss.

Formerly by 'at what time' etc. (see pl 6 of sec 1) the subjects having been set forth there, by 'whom' has been discussed at great length; now he comments on the original text to describe the other shares. 'Now' means after having filled up the unedited original text which is essentially important in the original, 'these' means the third.

Mitākṛd.

यदा विभागं पिता चिकीर्षति तदा इच्छया विभजेत् पुत्रानात्मनः सकाशात्
पुत्रं पुत्री पुत्रान् ॥ २ ॥

यदा yadā, when, विभागम् vibhāgam partition पिता pitā father, चिकीर्षति chikirṣati, wishes to make, तदा tadā, then, इच्छा ichchhāyā at pleasure, विभजेत् vibhajet, should separate पुत्रान् putrān, sons, आत्मन ātmanah, himself, सकाशात् sakāśāt, from (himself), पुत्रम् putram, a son, पुत्रौ putrau, two sons, पुत्रान् putrān, sons

2. When a father wishes to make a partition he may at his pleasure separate his children from himself, whether one, two, or more sons.

Balambhatta's gloss

2 He now proceeds avoiding the fault of repetition 'when' means 'if', 'may make', here imperative is not wanted. It is in the secondary sense of 'wishes to make' 'Then', 'with pleasure' means 'at his pleasure', 'separate' means 'may separate them by allotting them their shares in the inheritance' He says further in order to accom. his wish, 'from himself' means that after separation there is indifference on his part whether they continue to live joint or separate from one another. When he says 'sons', it is with a view to remove the doubt to the effect that there is no partition when there are many coheirs. 'Son', it is with a view to explain the ekaśeṣa dvandva samāsa, it is like anudātānām (of the low accents),

Mitakeśara

इच्छाया निरङ्कुशत्वादनियमप्राप्ती नियमार्थमाह ः ज्येष्ठं वा श्रेष्ठभागेनेति । ज्येष्ठं श्रेष्ठभागेन मध्यमं मध्यभागेन कनिष्ठं कनिष्ठं कनिष्ठभागेन विभजेदित्यनुवर्तते ॥ ३ ॥

इच्छायाः ichchhāyāḥ, of the will, निरङ्कुशत्वात् nirāṅkuśatvāt, as it is as no restriction, अनियम अनियमा, no rule, प्राप्ती prāptau, being had, seen, नियमार्थम्, niyamārtham by way of restriction आह āho, says (the author), ज्येष्ठम् jyēṣṭham, the oldest, वा वा or श्रेष्ठभागेन śreṣṭha bhāgena by the best share, इति iti, the words mean, ज्येष्ठम् jyēṣṭham, the oldest, श्रेष्ठभागेन śreṣṭha bhāgena, by the best share, मध्यमम् madhyaman the middle one, मध्यभागेन madya bhāgena, with a middle share, कनिष्ठम् kanīṣṭham, the worst, कनिष्ठभागेन kanīṣṭha bhāgena, by the worst share, विभजेत् vibhajet, should separate, इति iti, this, अनुवर्तते anuvartate is understood.

II No rule being suggested (for the will is unrestrained), the author adds, by way of restriction, 'he may separate (or this term is again understood) the eldest with the best share,' the middlemost

with a middle share, and the youngest with the worst share

Bālabhāṭṭa's gloss

3 Unrestrained, means 'by reason of being irregular', 'by way of restriction' as a restrictive rule. He makes the observation to be in conformity with the text of Manu, the 'middlemost', he says out of desirability, 'may separate', it is to suggest respect in the observation (upalaksana)*

Mitākṣara

श्रेष्ठादिविभागश्च मनुनोक्तः । (अ० ६ ख० ११२) ज्येष्ठस्य विशउद्भागः सर्वद्रव्यान् यद्वत् । ततोऽर्धं मध्यमस्य स्वाचुरीयं तु पवीयस इति ॥४॥

श्रेष्ठादि Śreṣṭhādi, of the best etc, विभाग vibhāgaḥ, the distribution, च cha, and, मनुना manuṇā, by Manu, उक्त uktah, as said, propounded, ज्येष्ठस्य jyēṣṭhasya, for the eldest, विश विशah, the twentieth part, यद्वा yadvā, to be deducted, सर्वद्रव्यान् sarva dravyān, of all the wealth, (heritage) च cha, and, together with, यद् yad, whatever, वरम् varam, the best, ततः tataḥ, of that, अर्धम् ardham, half, मध्यमस्य madhyamasya, of the middle one, स्वात् syāt, should be, तुरीयम् turīyam, a quarter, तु tu, but, पवीयसः pāvīyasaḥ, for the youngest, इति itī, thus it is to be understood

4. This distribution of best and other portions is propounded by Manu. "The portion deducted for the eldest is the twentieth part of the heritage, with the best of all the chattels; for the middlemost, half of that for the youngest, a quarter of it."

Bālabhāṭṭa's gloss

4 'Best and others' 'and' (cha) in the sense of 'but', its explanation will be clear gradually in the book itself.

Mitākṣara

वाच्यमोक्त्यमाणपक्षपेक्षः । सर्वे वा स्युः समांशिन इति । सर्वे वा ज्येष्ठा द्या समांशभाजः कर्तव्या ॥ ५ ॥

वाच्यम् vā śabdah, the word either, or, वक्ष्यमाण vakṣyamāna, what will be spoken subsequently, पक्ष pakṣa, alternative, अपेक्षा apekṣā, relative

* It is an implication of something that is not expressed

to, सर्वे sarve, all वा vā or, स्युः syuh, should be , समंशिनः samānśinah, equal sharers , इति it, that is , सर्वे sarve, all , वा vā or, ज्येष्ठादय ज्येष्ठādayah, the eldest and others , समंशभाज samānśabhājah, partakers of equal portions , कर्तव्या kartavyāh, should be made

5. The term 'either' is relative to the subsequent alternative 'or all may equal sharers' That is, all, namely, the eldest and the rest, should be made partakers of equal portions

Bālabhattacha's gloss

5 'The word 'or' in 'or all' of the succeeding part of the verse (4th quatrain), when read with the rule laid down in the first part being useless, is the word 'either' (or) in 'either the eldest' not useless as it is appropriate to denote the first option? Not so, by reason of sanctioning the unequal division at choice by the first clause because the unequal division is contradictory to the original texts as will be shown later on. Therefore he says, 'the term either' denotes that it is correlative with the unequal distribution of Manu, less the additional share allotted to be gradually explained, so there is no impropriety in the reality thereof

He explains the fourth quatrain 'or all', in 'equal sharers' the affix 'in' is added in the sense of praise by bahuvrīhi compound, it means 'no deprivation of wealth' 'Partakers of equal portions,' he says, as said previously, 'should be made' by the father is understood. Here by 'when makes a partition' the time of partition is meant, by 'father' is meant by whom partition (is to be made) From the succeeding line of the verse, it should be understood how partition (is to be effected)

Mitākṣara

अयं च विपमोविभागः स्वार्जितद्रव्यविषयः । पितृक्रमायाते तु समस्वाम्यस्य
वक्ष्यमाणत्वात्तच्छ्रुत्वा विपमोविभागीयुक्तः ॥ ६ ॥

अयम् ayam, this च cha, and, विपम viṣamah, unequal, विभाग vibhāḡah, distribution , स्वार्जित द्रव्य विषयः svārjita dravya viṣayah, has for its subject the property acquired by himself , पितृ क्रमायाते pitṛ krama-āyāte, as regards what has descended from the father, तु tu, but, सम-स्वाम्यस्य sama svāmyasya, equal ownership , वक्ष्यमाणत्वात् vakṣyamānatvāt, for it will be declared , न na, not , इच्छया icchayā, at his pleasure , विपमः viṣamah, an unequal , विभागः vibhāḡah, distribution , युक्तः yuktah, proper.

6. This unequal distribution supposes property by himself acquired, But, if the wealth descended to him from his father, an

unequal partition at his pleasure is not proper; for equal ownership will be declared

Bālabhāṭṭa's gloss

6 He now gives the special (feature) 'this' : o the partition made by the father, 'but if descended to him from his father', means 'property', 'equal ownership' means that it is to be divided equally otherwise by the above-said mode, there will be meaninglessness

Mitāksarā

विभागं चेत्पिता कुर्यादिति यदा पितुर्विभागेच्छा स तावदेककालः । अपरोऽपि जीवत्यपि पितरि द्रव्यनिःस्पृहे निवृत्तरमणे मातरि च निवृत्तरजस्कायां पितरनिच्छायामपि पुत्रेच्छादयविभागोभवति । यथोक्तनारदेन । अत ऊर्ध्वं पितुः पुत्रादिभजेऽयुधनं सममिति । पित्रोर्ऊर्ध्वं विभागं प्रतिपाद्यमातुर्निवृत्ते रजसि प्रसाप्त भगिनिषु च । निवृत्त चापि रमणे पितर्युपरतस्पृह इति द्योतितः । अत्रपुत्रा धनं सम विभजेयुस्तिष्ठन्नुपगते । गौतमेनापि । ऊर्ध्वंपितुः पुत्रा रिष्यन्विभजेरभित्युक्त्वा निवृत्त चापि रजसीति द्वतीयः कालोदर्शितः । जोषति चेद्वितीति सूतीयः कालो द्योतितः । तथा स रजस्कायामपि मातर्यनिच्छत्त्वपि पितर्यभ्रमवतिनि दीर्घरोगप्रसूते च पुत्राणामिच्छया भवति विभागः । यथाह शङ्खः ॥ अकामेपितरि रिष्यविभागोऽद्वये विपरोतसेतसि रोगिणि चेति ॥ ७ ॥

विभागम् vibhāgam, distribution, partition, separation, चेत् chet, if, पिता pita, father, कुर्यात् kuryāt, would do, इति iti, according to this, यदा yadā if, when, पितुः pitaḥ, the father's, विभागेच्छा vibhāgechchhā, the desire for partition, स sah, that, तावद् āvad, then, एक ekah, one; कालः kālah, period, अपरः aparah, another, अपि api, too, जीवति jīvati, be living, अपि api, even though, पितरि pitari, the father, द्रव्य-निस्पृहे dravya nisprīhe, indifferent to wealth, निवृत्त रमणे nivṛtta ramaṇe, disinclined to pleasure, मातरि mātari, the mother, च cha and, निवृत्त रजसायाम् nivṛtta rajasāyā, being not as incapable of bearing more sons पितुः pitaḥ, of the father, अनिच्छायाम् anichchhāyām, if there be no wish (of the father), अपि api, even, पुत्रेच्छया putra ichchhāyā, by the wish of the sons, यथा yathā, as, उक्तम् uktam, as said, वारदेन Nārada, by Nārada, अतः ऊर्ध्वं atah ūrdhvaṁ, after this: पितुः pitaḥ, father's (wealth), पुत्रः putrah, the sons, विभजेयुः vibhajeyuḥ may divide; धनम् dhanam, wealth; समम् samam, equally, इति iti, with these words, पित्रोः pitroḥ, both the parents, ऊर्ध्वम् ūrdhvaṁ, after, विभागम् vibhāgam, partition, प्रतिपाद्यं pratipādyam, having mentioned, promised, मातुः mātah, of the mother निवृत्ते nivṛtte, being stopped for ever, रजसि rajasi, the menstrual

He then gives the third period 'so', but the different reading 'nir' (without) has been explained with this ends the quotation from Gautama. Having himself given two periods, he gives the third period, 'while the father lives if he desires, and a third' he means, that the third period is one when the father wishes during his life time and is also addicted to sensual pleasures. He explains it 'while the mother is capable of bearing more issue' in reality it is first in reading, it is already explained and it should be understood that it requires a cursory explanation. 'Though the father be unwilling' to the partition of, lasting incurable 'and' (cha), indicates 'old age'. 'When there is a desire of the son' is understood; he therefore explains it by reason of its not being mentioned in the original text. 'It is declared', 'without the wish not wishing the separation, 'disturbed in intellect' means being addicted to unrighteousness, in 'rogini' the affix 'in' is added in the sense of excess, 'or' is to indicate option. Similarly it should be understood in the preceding (part) also, by this, there are two periods only (1) at the option of the father and (2) when he dies there is no third period. The period when the mother is past child bearing applies to the ancestral property. This clashes with the preceding by reason of the contradiction with Sankha, because there is no authority in support of that alone and there is possibility of truth in its real nature and conflict with the previous. So the third period should be accepted as regards the ancestral property. By this the above said contrary explanation is refuted.

Mitākera

पितुर्विच्छया विभागोद्विधा दत्तित समोचिपमस्य तत्र समविभागे पित्रेऽस्माह ।

यदि कुर्यात्समानंशान् पत्न्यः कार्यः समांशिकाः ।

न दत्त स्त्रीधनं यासां भर्त्रा वा स्वसुरेण वा । ११५ ॥

पितुः pituḥ, by the father's, इच्छया icchhayā, by the desire or, will ; विभागः vibhāgaḥ, partition द्विधा dvīdhā, of two sorts, दत्तित dātāt, has been stated, समः samaḥ equal, विषमं vīṣamaḥ, unequal, च cha, and, तत्र tatra, there, समविभागे sama vibhāge, in the case of equal partition, विशेषम् viśeṣam a special rule आह āha, adds says यदि यदि, if, कुर्यात् kuryāt he make समं sama equal अंशान् anśān, parts, allotments, पत्न्यः patnyāḥ, wives कार्यः kā, should be made, rendered समोद्विधा samodvīdhā, partakers of like portions न na, not, दत्तं dattam, given, स्त्रीधनम् strīdhanam, the so arate property of the wife, यासाम् yasām, whom, भर्त्रा bhartṛā, by the husband, वा vā, either, स्वसुरेण śvasureṇa, by the father in law, वा va or

8. Two sorts of partition at the pleasure of the father have

been stated, namely, equal and unequal. The author adds a special rule in the case of equal partition.

‘If he make the allotments equal, his wives, to whom no separate property has been given by the husband or the father-in-law, must be rendered partakers of like portions.’.

Balambhatta's gloss.

8. ‘Partition,’ the first one, ‘stated’ by the original writer; he describes it in a reverse order suggesting that the equal partition is the established truth and is sanctioned in the original; ‘equal’; ‘there’ (*tatra*), between the two.

Mitākṣra.

यद्वा स्वेच्छया पिता स्वयमेव सुतान् समविभागिनः करोति तदा पत्न्यश्च पुत्रसमांशभाजाः कर्तव्याः । यासां धर्माणां भर्ता स्वशुरेश वा स्त्रीधनं न दत्तम् । दत्ते तु स्त्रीधने अर्धायं वक्ष्यति दत्ते स्वर्धं प्रकल्पयेदिति । ६ ॥

यदा yadā when ; स्वेच्छया svechchhayā, by his own choice ; पिता pītā, father ; सर्वान् sarvān, all ; एव eva, indeed ; सुतान्, sutañ, sons ; सम-विभागिनः sama vibhāginah, partakers of equal shares ; करोति karoti, makes, तदा tadā then , पत्न्यः patnyah, wives ; च cha, and ; पुत्रसमांशभाजाः putra-samānśabhājāḥ, participants of shares equal to those of sons ; कर्तव्याः kartavyāḥ, should be made ; यासाम् yāsam, to which ; पत्नीनाम्, patnīnām, wives भर्ता bhartā by the husband , स्वशुरेश् स्वशुरेश्, by the father-in law ; वा vā or ; स्त्री-धनम् strīdhanam, separate property for a woman ; न na, not , दत्तम् dattam, given ; दत्ते datte, if it be given ; स्त्री-धने strīdhane, special property for a woman ; अर्धायं ardhānśam, half a share , वक्ष्यति vakṣyati, dictates, directs , दत्ते datte, if anything be given ; तु, but , अर्धम् ardham, half , प्रकल्पयेत् prakalpayet, let him assign.

‘D. When the father, by his own choice, makes all his sons partakers of equal portions, his wives, to whom, peculiar property had not been given by their husband, or by the father-in-law, must be made partakers of shares equal to those of sons. But, if separate property have been given to a woman, the author subsequently directs half a share to be allotted to her : “or if any had been given, let him assign the half.”

tribhajati, distributes; तदा tadā, then; पत्न्याः patnyāḥ, wives; चेष्टादि भागान्
 cheṣṭādi bhāgān, the superior and similar shares; न ना, not; लभन्ते
 labhante, do take, do get; किंतु kintu, but; उद्धृतादिभिरुद्धृता-uddhṛatādi-
 from which the son's deductions have been subtracted; समुदायत् समु-
 दा, āt, from the aggregate; समान् samān, equal; एव eva, indeed; अंशान्
 aṁśān, parts. स्वदारम् स्वा-uddhāram, their own shares (deducted); च
 cha, and, besides; यथा yathā, as; आह āha, says; आपस्तम्बः
 āpastambā; परिभाष्यम् paribhāṣyam, the furniture; च च, and; गृहे grihe,
 in the house; अलङ्कारः alaṅkāraḥ, ornaments; अपाङ्गाः bhāryāḥ, belong to
 the wife, become the wife's property.

10. But if, he give the superior allotment to the eldest son,
 and distribute similar unequal shares to the rest, his wives do not
 take such portions, but receive equal shares of the aggregate from
 which the son's deductions have been subtracted, besides their
 own appropriate deductions specified by Apastamba: "The furniture
 in the house and her ornaments are the wife's (property)."

Bālabhāṭṭa's gloss.

10. With this object in view, he says 'if superior', from the
 allotted additional share; it is bahubhīhi compound and means 'of the sons.'
 It must be equal being not sanctioned by the text, so he says rightly 'like
 equal'; 'own', wife. There is, therefore, an authority in the latter case;
 so he says, 'domestic furniture, chair, utensils made of clay and stone etc,
 ornaments, worn clothes go to the share of the wife', this is the meaning.
 According to Haridatta the chariot of the father and the furniture in
 the house both go to the father, ornaments go to the wife and the gift
 made by the caste people also go to the wife according to some."

Here by 'if he make', the partition at the option of father but not at
 the option of the wife is laid down; that is also up to the division of the
 sons' shares (but) not of their own accord, 'there is no partition between the
 husband and wife' etc. having been laid down by Apastamba and others
 as said previously, it is impossible by reason of her being said to be one
 (with her husband) So says the Śruti "the wife is the other half of the self."
 It also means according to Manu 'they are not free while they are alive',
 (Manu IX.104) because she becomes subordinate by reason of the son; but
 when there are more wives than one, on account of the plural number each
 wife should be allotted an equal share with the son along with his own. It

does not mean that they should be separated by giving them shares they are, therefore, said to be equal partakers here but not to be separated like sons by giving them equal shares. The rule laid down by Āpastamba does not apply when there is no partition of the property but what is said has been fully explained previously by the commentator in connection with the subject of 'surety'. In Madanarātna there is also the same thing, in this way just as in the first alternative when the partition is effected while the father is alive, so also in the other two alternatives when it is given, it should be understood that legally there must be maintenance at the option of the son just like the father.

CXVI

Mudākara

येष्टं वा श्रेष्ठभागेन सर्वं वा स्युः समांशिन इति पक्षद्वयेऽप्यपवादमाह
शक्तस्यानीहमानस्य किञ्चिद्वत्त्वा पृथक् क्रिया ।

येष्टम् *yeṣṭham*, the eldest, वा *vā* either, श्रेष्ठभागेन *śreṣṭhabhāgena*, by a superior share, सर्वं *sarva*, all, वा *vā*, or, स्युः *syuh*, should be, समांशिनः *samānśinah*, partakers of equal shares; इति *iti*, in these, पक्षद्वये *pakṣa-dvaye*, two alternatives, अपि *api*, also, अपवादम् *apavādam*, an exception, आह *āha*, says, propounds, शक्तस्य *śaktasya*, of one who is able to support himself, अनीहमानस्य *anīhamānasya*, not desirous of participation, किञ्चिद् *kiccid*, some thing, a trifle, दत्त्वा *datvā*, by giving, पृथक्-क्रिया *prithak-kriyā*, making separate

11. To the alternative before stated (§1) the author propounds an exception.

"The separation of one who is able to support himself and is not desirous of participation may be effected by giving him some 'trifle'."

Mudākara

स्वयमेव *svayam-eva*, himself, द्रव्यार्जनसमर्थस्य *dravyārjana samartha-sya*, to one who is able to earn wealth, पितृ-द्रव्यम् *pitṛ-dravyam*, father's

स्वयमेव *svayam-eva*, himself, द्रव्यार्जनसमर्थस्य *dravyārjana samartha-sya*, to one who is able to earn wealth, पितृ-द्रव्यम् *pitṛ-dravyam*, father's

wealth, goods; अनिच्छमानश्च anichchamānasya, not desirous of ; अनिच्छताः anichchataḥ, not desirous of sharing; यत्किञ्चपि yat-kiñ-chiṭi, any thing, whatsoever; अश्रमम् aśram, not valuable; अपृथक् aprithak, not separated; कृत्वा kṛvā, making, विभागः vibhāgaḥ, partition, separation, कार्यः kāryaḥ, should be made; पित्रा pitrā, by the father; सपुत्रादीनाम् tat putra-ādīnām, on the part of his sons and others; दापयिष्या दाया jāyārikṣā, future claim on heritage; नाभूद् nā bhūd, should not be, इति iti, so

CXVI.

To one who is himself able to earn wealth, and who is not desirous of sharing his father's wealth, anything whatsoever, though not valuable, may be given, and the separation or division may be thus effected by the father, so that the children or other heirs of that son may have no subsequent desire to claim a partition.

Balambhatta's gloss.

11 and 12. Here is an explanation of 'able' (Y); 'himself' (M) is understood; 'father', it is also explained; 'not desirous,' he says that it is inherent in the word, 'though not-valuable,' by 'api' there is conjunction of similar things of the same class (*ejusdem generis*), he assigns a reason: 'the children of that,' *iti* means for this reason.

Mitākṣha.

ज्येष्ठं वा श्रेष्ठभागनेति न्यूनाधिकविभागोदर्शितः तत्र या अंकोद्घातादिविषम-
विभागव्यतिरेकेणान्यथाविषमविभागनिषेधार्थमाह

न्यूनाधिकविभक्तानां धर्म्यः पितृकृतः स्मृतः ॥ ११६॥

ज्येष्ठम् jyēṣṭham, the oldest; वा vā, either; श्रेष्ठभागेन śreṣṭha-bhāgena, by the best share; इति iti, by this; न्यूनाधिकविभागः nūna-adhika-vibhāgaḥ, the distribution of greater or less shares, दर्शितः darśitaḥ, is shown, तत्र tatra, in such a case; शास्त्रोक्तान् śāstra-ukta, as are indicated by the law; उद्घातादि uddhāraḍi, by means of deductions; विषम-विभागव्यतिरेकेण viśama-vibhāga-vyatirekeṇa, than that which renders the distribution uneven;

13 The distribut^o of greater and less shares has been shown. (31) To forbid, in such case, an unequal partition made in any other mode^than that which renders the distribution uneven by means of deduction^s, such as are directed by the law, the author adds, "A legal distribution, made by the father among sons separated with greater or less shares, is pronounced val^d"

Balambhatta's gloss

He explains the relevancy of the subsequent (average, 'either eldest' 'Y' 'there' (M) in such a case, there is a compound with the third *evāhakti* 'in deduction etc (uddhārati) 'otherwise' If it so be, 'then, then etc 'D' rec^d by the law' includes that which follows he says because the prohibition is not clear, it means in support of it. Otherwise 'when the father makes a partition, let him separate his sons at his pleasure' supports the third alternative (period) and clearly renders the Manu's text as to an equal partition without deduction useless. Similarly Vishnu says "If the father separates his sons, it is at his option in his self acquisition." Brihaspati says "One should make a donation and partition of his wealth at his option." Nārada says "Let the father while hale and healthy, separate his sons with the best share to the eldest or at his own wish" (XIII 4) The text from Nārada supports the commentator's explanation of the original text. From this indicates a partition at the option of each but not a partition with an additional share' supporting the view 'let the father separate the sons at his option', the argument of the *manu* (Māda) is refuted by reason of its conflict with Vishnu and Nārada etc and the explanation of Viṣṇuswara being doubtful. For this reason though the text of Manu 'he divided the property amongst the sons' is of general application and is said to be in support of the equal partition and against the unequal partition, yet it is set aside by the rule 'the experts in the science of logic consider that *nyāyaveda** is no *vidhā* and shows the weakness based on the absence of the *śāstra*, its refutation is there clear and has been shown previously. By this it is also refuted that the unequal partition at the option of the father in his self-acquisition is in accordance with the law and also virtuous. The father in the course of the partition during his life shall not give preference to one, nor shall he deprive another of his share capriciously without any cause.

Mitākṣa

न्यूनाधिकविभागेन विभक्तानां पुत्राणामसौ न्यूनाधिकविभागोयदि धर्म्यः
शास्त्रोक्तो भवति तदासौ पितृहृत इत्यप्यन नियतंते इति मन्वादिभिः स्मृत ।
अन्यथा तु पितृ-तोऽपि निर-ते इत्यभिप्राय । यथाह नारदः । न्यायितं पुपित-वे

* As for the explanation, see the *Mīmāṃsā Introduction* Vol XXVIII. P. P XXIV and XXVII

विषयःसुक्तमानस । अन्यथाशास्त्रकारी च न विभागे पिता प्रभुरिति । १३ ॥

न्यूनधिकविभागेन nyūnādhika vibhāgaṇa, by an unequal partition, विभक्तानाम् vibhaktānām, separated पुत्रणाम् putrāṇām, among s na, अथै asan, that न्यूनधिक विभागे nyūnādhika vibhagāḥ, partition of more or less, यदि vadi, when धर्म dharmaḥ legal शास्त्रोक्त śāstra uktāḥ, as ordained by the law, भवति bhavati, is तदा tadā then, अथै asan, that, पितृकृतः pitṛa kṛitah, made by the father कृतः kṛitah, made, एव eva, finally, completely, already न na न विवर्तते nivartate, can be set aside इति iti, so, मन्वादिभिः manvādibhiḥ, by Manu and the rest, स्मृतः smṛitah, ordained, declared अन्यथा anyathā, otherwise, else तु tu, but, पितृकृतः pitṛa kṛitah, made by the father, अपि api, also, निवर्तते nivartate, can be set aside इति iti, such is, अभिप्रायः abhiprāyaḥ the meaning, यथा yathā as नारदः āha, says, नारदः nāradaḥ, Nārada, स्वस्थः vyādhitah, afflicted by disease, क्रुपितः kupitah, influenced by wrath, विषयवक्त-मानसः viśayāsakta mānasah, whose mind is engrossed by a beloved object, अन्यथा-शास्त्रकारी anyathā śāstra kārī, one who acts otherwise than the law permits च चा and, न na, not, विभागे vibhāge, in the distribution (of the estate), पिता pita, the father, प्रभुः prabhuḥ, has power, इति iti, thus

14. When the distribution of more or less among sons separated by an unequal partition is legal or such as ordained by the law, then that division, made by the father, is completely made, and cannot be afterwards set aside as is declared by Manu and the rest. Thus it falls, though made by the father. Such is the meaning; and in like manner, Nārada declares, "A father, who is afflicted with disease, or influenced by wrath, or whose mind is engrossed by a beloved object, or who acts otherwise than the law permits, has no power in the distribution of the estate."

Bālabhāṭṭa's gloss

14 The text of Kātyāyana applies to the case of an unequal son and is, therefore not contradictory and does not support your view (says an objector). He (the author) says in reply that the words 'more or less' show partition 'less,' therefore "The sons should be maintained and guided by the shares—whether equal, less or more—allotted to them by the father." Brihaspati. "Whatever share has been allotted by the father on partition (to the sons), is in accordance with law, because he is master of all." Nārada XIII 15 supports it. The meaning of 'in accordance with dharma (law)' is 'as laid down by the Scripture.' Being not connected here and by filling up many ellipses it is explained. If the prohibi-

tion is not explained, there is shifting of ground, he, therefore, gives a distinction. 'Else' (anyathā) means 'it is illegal', there is another reading *anyathā sūtra* (not in accordance with the Śāstra) The meaning is the same as 'anythā', another reading

END OF SECTION II

SECTION III

Mudhāra

इदानीं विभागस्य कालान्तरं कर्त्तव्यं प्रकरनियममाह

विभजेरनुसुताः पित्रोरुर्ध्वं रिक्यमृणं समम् ।

इदानीम् *idānim*, next, now, विभागस्य *vibhagasya*, of the partition; कालान्तरम् *kālāntaram* another period, कर्त्तव्यम् *kartrantaram*, other persons as making it, प्रकरनियमम् *prakāra niyama*, a rule respecting the mode, चाह *āha*, propounds, विभजेरन् *vibhajoran*, should distribute, सुता *sutāḥ*, sons, पित्रो *pitroḥ*, the parents (two), ऊर्ध्वम् *ūrdhvam*, after रिक्यम् *rikyam*, the effects, मृणम् *mṛaṇam*, the debts, समम् *samam* equally

1. The author next propounds another period of partition, 'other persons as making it, and a rule respecting the mode. 'Let sons divide equally both the effects and the debts after (the 'of demise of) their two parents.'

Balambhatta's gloss

1 In this way, he has given three periods of partition during the father's life time, the collection of texts was with the object that the father was alive. Now after his death there is another fourth period as regards this, he expresses his opinion 'So he says' he gives the original in support 'Now' (*M*) means after having said all this. In this way, the sage has divided it into two only, one during his life time and the other after his death. There are three alternatives as to the partition during the father's life time (1) at the option of the father (2) without his wish the latter should also be made (3) divided two fold according to the above said rule. By (the passage) "Or all may be equal sharers" (114) it is also shown, both alternatives should be understood to be included in

an equal partition. He gives the special feature of the third (distinguishing it from the former 'Propounds a rule')

Mitākara

पित्रोर्मातापित्रोरुभयं अयाणादिति कालोदर्शितः । सुतारति कर्तारोदर्शिता
सममिति प्रकार नियमः सममेवेति रिक्त्यमूण च विभजेत् । २ ॥

पित्रोः pitroh, of the two parents मातर्पित्राः mātā pītrah, of the mother and the father, उत्पद्य् ūrdhvaṃ, after, अयाणाद् ayaṇād, the demise, इति itī, so, काल कālāḥ, period, दर्शित darśitah, is shown, सुता sūtāḥ, the sons इति itī, by these, कर्तार kartārah, the persons as making दर्शितः darśitāḥ, are shown, समम् samam, equally, इति itī, by this प्रकार-नियम prakāra niyamah, a rule as to the mode, समम् samam, equally, in equal shares एव eva, indeed only, इति itī, thus, रिक्त्यम् riktham, effects, कृण्वत् kṛiṇvāt, debts*, विभजेत् vibhajetaḥ, they should divide

2 After their two parents] After the demise of the father and mother here the period of the distribution is shown. The sons] The persons, who make the distribution, are thus indicated Equally] A rule respecting the mode is by this declared in equal shares only, should they divide the effects and debts.

Jalambhāṭṭa's gloss

2 In order to set aside the breakingup of the compound (माता च पित्र च) he says 'mother', he explains the appropriateness of 'after', 'after the departure (demise)' means after the death 'Sons' (सुता) should also be understood chesha compound (सुतश्च सुतौ च) like the preceding the paternal uncles being prior should be considered first entitled in partition, the daughters being specially dealt with should not be considered first entitled here. How can it be a restrictive rule by this bare statement without 'eva' (only)? He, therefore, gives as its substance in the shape of a restrictive rule 'Equally,' means 'according to the rule of the (सर्वथाह्वयः) in order to remove the doubts as to equality and to achieve the object to be stated, he includes debts'

* The Maxim is (सर्वथाह्वयः सर्वथाह्वयः) It applies when in a sentence there is no word denoting definiteness, the definiteness will be fixed where the sense requires it, but where there are words such as एव etc to denote definiteness, the maxim does not apply See Vāchaśpatya

Mītākṣara

ननुष्यं पितुश्च मातुश्चैर्युपक्रम्य (मनु० अ० ६ श्लो० १०५) ज्येष्ठस्य तु
 गृहीयात्पितृयं धनमशेषतः । शेषास्तमुपजीवेयुष्यंयैव पितरं तथेत्युक्तत्वात्तम् (मनु० अ० ६
 श्लो० ११२) ज्येष्ठस्य विंशद्वारः सर्वद्रव्याश्च यद्वरम् । ततोऽर्धं मध्यमस्य स्यात्तुरीयं
 तुयवीयसदिति । सर्वस्माद्धनसमुदायाद्विंशतिमोभागः सर्वद्रव्येभ्यश्च यच्छ्रेष्ठं तज्येष्ठाय
 दातव्यम् । तद्वर्धं चत्वारिंशत्तमोभागोमध्यमं च द्वयं मध्यमाय दातव्यम् । तुरीय-
 मशीतितमोभागोहीनं द्वयं च कनिष्ठाय दातव्यमिति मातापित्रोरुर्ध्वं विभजतामुद्धार-
 विभागोमनुना दर्शितः । तथा । (मनु० अ० ६ श्लो० ११६, ११७) उद्धारोऽनुद्धृते त्वया-
 न्यं स्यादंशकल्पना । एकाधिकं हरेज्येष्ठः पुत्रोऽर्धं ततोऽनुजः । कंशमश यवीयास्त
 इति धर्मोऽयवस्थित इति । ज्येष्ठस्य द्वीमापौ तदनन्तरजातस्य सार्धं एकाभागः ततोऽनु-
 जाभामेकैकाविभागस्तुद्धारव्यतिरेकेणापि विभोविभागोदर्शितः । पित्रोरुर्ध्वं विभजतां
 जीवद्विभागे च स्वयमेव विभोविभागोदर्शितोज्येष्ठं वा श्रेष्ठभागेनेति । अतः सर्वस्मिन्नपि
 काले विभोविभागोऽस्तीति कथं सममेव विभजेरन्निति नियम्यते । ३ ॥

ननु nann, but , ऊर्ध्वम् ūrdhvam, after , पितुः pituh, the father ,
 च cha, and , मातुः mātuh, the mother , च cha, and , इति iti, so , उपक्रम्य u-
 pkrāmya, having promised , ज्येष्ठः jyeṣṭhaḥ, the eldest , एव eva, only,
 indeed , तु tu, but , गृहीयात् gr̥hñiāt, may take, पितृयम् pitryam, the pater-
 nal, of the father , धनम् dhanam, wealth , अशेषतः aśeṣataḥ, entire , शेषः
 śeṣaḥ, the rest , तम् tam, him , उपजीवेयुः upajīveyuḥ, live under , यथा
 yathā, as , एव eva, just, exactly , पितरम् pitaraṁ, under their father ,
 तथा tathā, so , इति iti, thus , उक्त्वा uktvā, having declared ज्येष्ठस्य jye-
 ṣṭhasya, for the eldest , विंशः viṁśaḥ, the twentieth part , उद्धारो uddhāraḥ,
 the portion deducted , सर्व-द्रव्याम् sarva-dravyāt, of all the chattels ,
 च cha and , यद् yad, whatever वरम् varam, is the best , तत् tataḥ, of
 that , अर्धम् ardham, half , मध्यमस्य madhyamasya, for the middle one ;
 स्यात् syāt, should be तुरीयम् turyam, the fourth part , तु tu, but , यवीयसा
 yavīyasaḥ, of the younger , इति iti, thus , सर्वस्मात् sarvasmāt, from or all,
 धनसमुदायाद् dhana samudāyāt, the aggregate wealth , विंशतः viṁśatamaḥ,
 the twentieth , भागं bhāgaḥ, part , सर्वद्रव्येभ्यः sarvadravyeḥ, of all
 the chattels , च cha, and , यद् yat, whatever , श्रेष्ठम् śreṣṭham, the best , तद्
 tat, that , ज्येष्ठस्य jyeṣṭhasya, to the eldest , दातव्यम् dātavyam, should be
 given , तद्वर्धम् tadardham, half of that , चत्वारिंशत्तमं chātvarīṁśat-tamaḥ,
 the fortieth , भागं bhāgaḥ, part , मध्यमम् madhyamam, the middle , च
 cha, and , द्रव्यम् dravyam, chattels , मध्यमाय madhyamāya, to the middle
 one , दातव्यं dātavyam, should be given तुरीयम् turyam, the one-fourth
 part , जीवद्वि-भागः jīvadvī-भागः, the eighth, भागं bhāgaḥ, part , हीनम् hīnam,

ordinary, of a lower kind, द्रव्यम् dravyam, chattels, कनिष्ठाय kanīṣṭhāya, to the youngest दातव्यम् dātavyam, should be given, इति iti, so, माता-पितरौ mātā-pitroh, mother and father, उत्तरम् ūrdhvam, after, विभजताम् vibhajatām, of those that divide, उद्धार उद्धार, of shares, विभाग vibhāgaḥ, distribution, मनुना mananā, by Mann, दर्शितः darśitah, is shown, तथा tathā similarly, उद्दारे ūddhāre, in case the share, अनुदृते anuddhrite, is not deducted, तु tu, but एषाम् eṣām, for these, इयम् iyam, this, एषाद् eṣāḍ, should be, अतः कल्पना amśa kalpanā, the plan of shares, the distribution of shares, the manner of distribution, एकाधिकम् ekādhikam, greater by one share, double share, हरेत् hareṣ, should take, ज्येष्ठः jyēṣṭhaḥ, the eldest, पुत्रः putrah, the son, अर्धपर्यम् adhyardham, a share greater by half ततः tataḥ after that, than that, अनुजः anujah, next born, younger, अंशम् aṁśam, a part each, यवियं यवियं yaviyāmsah, the younger ones, इति iti, thus, धर्मः dharmah, the law, व्यवस्थितः vyavasthitah, settled, इति iti, so, ज्येष्ठस्य jyēṣṭhasya, for the eldest, द्वौ dvau, two, भागौ bhāgau, parts, तदनन्तरजन्तस्य tadānantarajātasya, for the one born next, सार्धम् sārḍham, with a half, एको भागः eko bhāgaḥ, one part, ततः tataḥ, than that, अनुजानम् anujanām, for those that are younger, एको विभागः eka-eko vibhāgaḥ a part each, इति iti, thus, उद्धार-व्यतिरेकेण ūddhāra vyatirekeṇa, without deductions, अपि api, even, विषमः viśamah, an unequal, विभागः vibhāgaḥ, share, दर्शितः darśitah, is shown, पितरौ उत्तरम् pitroh-ūrdhvam, after the parents विभजताम् vibhajatām for those as dividing, जीवद्भिर्भागे jīvad vibhage, when a division is made during life time, च cha, and, स्वयम् svayam, by himself एव eva विषमः viśamah, an unequal, विभागः vibhāgaḥ distribution दर्शितः darśitah, is shown, ज्येष्ठः jyēṣṭhaḥ, the eldest, वा वा, or, अष्टभागेऽंशे aṣṭha bhāgena, by the best (greatest) share, इति iti, so, thus, मन्त्रात् by this, hence, सर्वस्मिन् sarvasmīn, at all, अपि api, even, काले kālē, at periods विषमः viśamah, unequal, विभागः vibhāgaḥ distribution, अस्ति asti, there is, इति iti so, कथम् katham, how, समम् samam in equal parts एव eva only, विभजेत् vibhajetan, should distribute, इति iti, so, निर्याते niyamyate, a restriction is introduced, a rule is made,

¶ But Mann, having promised "partition after the death of the father, and the mother" and having declared, "The eldest brother may take the patrimony entire, and the rest may live under him as under their father, has exhibited a "distribution with deductions, among brethren separating after the death of their father, and mother." The portion deducted for the eldest is the twentieth part

of the heritage with the best of all the chattels, for the middlemost, half of that; for the youngest, a quarter of it.' The twentieth part of the whole amount of the property (to be divided and the best of all the chattels, must be given (by way of deduction) to the eldest, half of that, or a fortieth part, and a middling chattel, should be allotted to the middlemost, and a quarter of it, or the eightieth part, with the worst chattel, to the youngest. He has also directed an unequal partition, but without deductions, among brethren separating after their parent's decease, allotting two shares to the eldest, one and a half to the next born, and one apiece to the younger brothers, 'If a deduction be thus made, let equal shares of the residue be allotted but, if there be no deduction, the shares must be distributed in this manner, let the eldest have double share, and the next born a share and a half, and the younger sons each a share, thus is the law settled. The author himself has sanctioned an unequal distribution when a division is made during the father's life-time ('Let him either dismiss the eldest with the best share &c.'). Hence an unequal partition is admissible in every period. How then is a restriction introduced, requiring that sons should divide only equal shares?

Balamāhātta' gloss

3 The first period of the partition during the life time of the father, has been said to be unequal in the original, the same has been said to be applicable to the partition after the death of the parents by Manu and others. When there is option by reason of the validity of both and when the equal and unequal partitions are both in accord with law it is proper to explain 'equal' to mean 'as equal also' but not 'equal only'. He accordingly doubts the propriety of the explanation while laying down a restrictive rule. From 'after' to 'restriction introduced', 'After' has been already explained and is written (used) with the object to mean 'after their demise', so also in the succeeding part, Patrimony (pitṛyaṃ) means 'come down from the father', *atīṣaḥ* (entire) has *fast* affix which is added in all forms of declensions, 'the rest' : a other than the eldest brother 'Live under him,' follow him like their father, it depends on the seniority by birth. So says Manu 'The eldest brother like the father may voluntarily support all, or the younger brother, if cap-

able, for the mainstay of the family depends on one's capacity" "With the consent of all let the younger brother if capable with the wish of all support others" Nārada XIII 5 It is a subject of consensus of opinion Thus in Manu the seniority is meant by implication, this he explains, 'of all the chatties' means 'of those to be divided' deduction is understood, एव is added in accusative, it means 'that which is deducted and is yogarudhā (conventional) it is connected with the succeeding under the rule of मध्यमग्नि* He says with the inherent power of it, 'all,' although it is connected with 'may be' brought in from elsewhere, yet he gives the result 'to the eldest' means by those who make partition or strangers or mutually By 'iti' he means that having said so, in these texts of Manu as indicated by 'iti', it is shown, therefore, to those who make partition, similarly in the following its meaning = that all should equally divide the rest of the property He gives the unequal partition mentioned in Manu in a different way. "Similarly (tathā)... of those who divide" is connected with 'similarly it is sanctioned', 'of those' means 'of the eldest', 'this' (यम्) to be stated, its explanation, 'of the eldest', it is also of the seniority by reason of the subject and the management he goes on to say further applying it to the subsequent: 'by the parents', is there no unequal partition, as it is not mentioned in the original? He replies to the objection with an illustration that it does not apply, is refuted by 'while alive' (जीव), 'himself' by the text writer. It conveys the meaning to the effect that it is difficult to say that the original text-writer did not wish it anywhere else The absence thereof can not be easily accounted for by reason of the general nature of the smṛiti texts and the want of proof there, he therefore says 'hence.'

Milākṣarā

अत्रोच्यते । सत्यम् । इयं विषमोविभागः शास्त्रदृष्ट्यापि लोभविहितव्याघात-
लुप्टेयः । अस्मदे लोकविहित धर्ममप्यशब्देन नितिनियेधान् । यथा । मदास्यमहाजं
पा धोत्रियायोपकरणेयदिति विधानेऽपि लोकविहितव्याघातनुष्ठानम् । यथा पा मैत्रायणी
यां पशामनुवन्ध्यामालमेतदिति मवात्मनयिधानेऽपि साकविहितव्याघातनुष्ठानम् । ४ ॥

* मध्यमग्निश्चाय is akin to मध्यदीपिकाश्चाय which is called the maxim of the central lamp. "The idea is of a lamp in a central position shedding its light on both sides. Akin to this is मध्यवर्गिश्चाय which is explained in the Pan (ist for Dec. 1867 as referring to the central ruby of a nose ring which casts a lustre on the pearl on each side of it." Jacob's Handful of popular maxims

अथ atra, in this question उपस्थिते upasthite, it is said, सत्यम् satyam, true, अयम् ayam this, विभागः vibhāgaḥ unequal division, शास्त्रदृष्टे śāstra dr̥ṣṭe, found in the sacred ordinances तथानि tattā, is still लोकविद्विष्टत्वात् loka vidvīṣṭatvāt be cause it is abhorred by the world, न ना not अनुष्ठाय anuṣṭhāyān should be practised ; अहर्गन्धम् ahargandham, not securing celestial bliss लोकविद्विष्टम् loka vidvīṣṭam, abhorred by the world, धर्म्यम् dharmyam I shall अपि api, even though आचरन् ācharet, should practice न न, not तु तु but, इति it, thus निषेचन् न पेक्षतः nipekṣhat owing to the prohibition because of the prohibition यथा yathā as, महाक्षम् mahākṣam a great bull or other मज्जनम् majjānam a great goat ; वा वा or, श्रेष्ठियाय śreṣṭhyāya, to a venerable priest उपकल्पयेत् upakalpyeṭ, should offer इति it, thus विधाने अपि vidhāne api, though there is this injunction, लोकविद्विष्टत्वात् loka vidvīṣṭatvāt, on account of popular prejudice अननुष्ठानम् ananusthānam non performance, यथा yathā as, वा वा or, मित्रावरुणौ मित्रावरुणौ, consecrated to Mitra and Varuna, गाय त्र्यम् gayatryam, a cow, वशाम् vashām, a victim अनुवन्ध्यम् anuvandhyām, a barren, आलभेत् alabhet, should slay, इति it, so, thus गवांश्च गवांश्च विधाने अपि gavāṃśch vidhāne api, though there is an injunction for killing of a cow, लोकविद्विष्टत्वात् loka vidvīṣṭatvāt, because of the prejudices of the people, अननुष्ठानम् ananusthānam, should not practise

4 The question is thus answered, True, this unequal partition is found in the sacred ordinances, but it must not be practised, because it is abhorred by the world, since that is forbidden by the maxim, "Practice not that which is legal, but is abhorred by the world for it secures not celestial bliss" as the practice of offering bulls is shunned, on account of popular prejudice, notwithstanding the injunction, "Offer to a venerable priest a bull or a large goat", and as the slaying of a cow is for the same reason disused, notwithstanding the precept, "Slay a barren cow as a victim consecrated to Mitra and Varuna"

Bālabhāṭṭa's gloss

4 Though by 'true' etc. he accepts its reality and rejects the proof in favour of its unreality, yet he does not accept the validity thereof in practice 'World, though abhorred by the world yet sanctioned by the Scripture and the people how is it not practicable?' The reply is 'not conducive to heaven which means that even a virtuous act if abhorred by the people should not be acted upon because it does not secure heaven' Unheavenliness is the reason for its abhorrence the meaning is that the Scripture having said so, it should not be acted up

on Here he gives an illustration from the *śrauta* 'as' it is original. He gives it from the *śrauta* 'or as', 'let one offer a barren cow consecrated to *Mitra* and *Varuna* the twin deities'. The *anuvandhyasti* (sacrifice of a barren cow) has been laid down by *Āpastamba* in a soma sacrifice after *udavāsānya* (disc duty). In the present he himself having allowed curd dish at the same place it should be understood that the latter is to be practised by the sacrificers.

Mitāśura

उक्त च । यथानियोगधर्मो नो नानुवन्द्यावचोऽपि वा । तयोद्धारविभागोऽपि नैव संप्रति वर्तत इति । ५ ॥

उक्तम् *uktam*, it is expressly declared च *cha* and यथा *yathā* just as, नियोग धर्म *niyoga dharmah*, the duty of an appointment (to raise up seed to another) नाना, for as (is not practised), न ना नो, अनुवन्द्या *anuvandhya* of a barren cow एव *vadhih* the slaying, अपि *api*, also; वा *va*, or, तथा *tathā*, similarly, उद्धारविभाग *uddhāra vibhāgaḥ*, partition with deduction, अपि *api*, too, न, na not, एव *eva* indeed, वर्तते *varṭate* at present, वर्तते *varṭate*, is in vogue.

5 It is expressly declared "As the duty of an appointment (to raise up seed to another,) and as the slaying of a cow for a victim are disused, so is partition with deductions (in favour of elder brothers)".

Balambhāṭṭa's gloss

॥ Having thus generally stated the desuetude of the unequal partition in the *Kaligūṇa* but not before and suggesting that even with the aid of the illustrations explaining the same and laying down the unequal partition with the additional share by deduction, he cites the text of *Bhāṭṭa* prohibiting the unequal partition with the said illustrations 'And it is said', '*nīyojāḥ*' (appointment) ceremony 'just other', other than the *Vedic* ceremony sanctioned by an injunctive text just like the sacrifice of a great bull etc should not (be allowed) the 'not' (*na*) should be connected with both. In the reading 'यथेति' (as duty) it means the duty of appointment नियोग it should be understood that the birth of a son from the husband's brother under (the text) "The husband's brother being directed by the elders shall cohabit with the sonless (widow)" I 68. 'no' नैत is in the negative sense. *Anuvandhya* means a barren cow, 'also' or in conjunction 'deduction' means 'additional share in a partition', 'also' is the second conjunction; 'now' in the *Kaligūṇa* *Māhātmya* therefore quotes from *Īśrakṛishṇa pūrāṇa* 'the marriage of a married woman

making a partition in his lifetime, should distribute the heritage equally among his sons", and having stated, as the doctrine of some, the eldest's succession to the whole estate, ("some hold, that the eldest is heir,") ; and having exhibited, as the notion of others, a distribution with deductions ("In some countries, the gold, the black kine, and the black produce of the earth, belong to the eldest son ; the car appertains to the father ; and the furniture in the house and her ornaments are the wife's ; as also the property [received by her] from kinsmen, so some maintain") has expressly forbidden it as contrary to the law, and has himself explained its inconsistency with the sacred codes ; "It is recorded in Scripture, without distinction, that Manu distributed his heritage among his sons"

Balamihatta's gloss.

B Apastamba has also disapproved of it ; so it is connected. Though he says before, 'Bhūṣaṅgī', though having consigned the eldest son with an excellent gift, yet it does not lead to the unequal partition but to the giving of consolation to him. Let him then satisfy his eldest son with some chief precious article like a cow etc as explained previously. With this object in view, he says, 'his own opinion.' Superseding 'the drunk or intoxicated', in the absence of a son, the nearest kinsman (sapinda), in his absence, the preceptor, in his absence the resident student may inherit the property and apply it in pious and religious objects ; or the daughter, in the absence of all, the king may take the whole property ; and 'having said so much' is understood 'The whole estate', here the claimant is the eldest son alone : it was already explained previously. Gautama also says, 'The whole goes to the senior most who maintains others.' 'in countries' etc, in some particular country. Haridatta says 'gold, black kine, 'black produce of earth' means black cereals produced from earth as rice and beans, some say, it means iron. All these go as the share of the eldest son. The chariot, the furniture of the house, utensils, stools etc go to the father. The worn ornaments fall to the share of the wife, others are of opinion that wealth got from the caste-people also go to the share of the wife." 'Contrary' against ; 'he himself', Āpastamba himself Manu, it is a quotation from the Taittirīya Samhitā (III-194) There 'among his sons' being in the plural and 'heritage' being in the singular, the inference is that it applies without distinction (generally) It is subsequent, and it is also treated as a solitary text "he separates the eldest son with the wealth", but the expert logicians do not consider *nityāsurada* to be *vidhāna* it is said See *Mādhava* introduction vol XXVIII, p, p XXIV and XXVII

Atakya

तस्माद्विधो विभागः शास्त्रद्वयेऽपि लोकविरोधाद्भुतिविरोधाच्च नातुष्टेय इति

सममेव विभजेरनिति नियम्यते । ७ ॥

समाद् *tasmat*, therefore, विषम *visamāh* unequal विभाग *vibhāgaḥ*, distribution, शास्त्रदृष्टः *śāstradrīṣṭaḥ* noticed by the codes of law, अपि *api*, though, लोकविरोधत् *loka-virodhāt* because of its disapproval by the world, श्रुतिविरोधात् *śruti-virodhāt*, because of the contrariness to the scripture, because **II** is against the scriptures च *cha*, and न नो, not, अनुष्ठेय *anustheyah*, should be practised, इति *iti* for this reason, समम् *samam*, in equal parts, एव *eva*, only विभजेत् *vibhajetan*, should distribute, इति *iti*, so, नियम्यते *niyamate*, a rule is made a restriction is ordained

7 Therefore, unequal partition, though noticed in codes of law, should not be practised, since it is disapproved by the world and is contrary to Scripture. For this reason, a restriction is ordained, that brethren should divide only in equal shares.

Balambhatta's gloss

7 He concludes the established truth (*siddhānta* view) therefore, 'scripture' means the sages. 'Equal' therefore this relates to the partition during the lifetime which is set forth as a rule and is also later on maintained, 'or the eldest' on the contrary relates to some other *yuga*, like others. "The father while alive should not give preference to one over the others, nor shall he deprive another of his share capriciously for no cause"

This from *Kātyāyana* is also in favour. Therefore less or more which has been said above under the text of *Nārada* does not mean that it should be so acted upon but if a father by chance under the authority of the Scripture without noticing the special text makes an unequal partition in the manner as laid down by the Scripture, it is not to be set aside. This is the purport but the real meaning has already been expressed by the commentator, it should be borne in mind that there is no contradiction.

Here 'after the father's demise is said and *Manu* has also supported it by 'after the death of the father and mother' (IX—114). So the period after the death of both is obtained i.e. after the death of each of them, in this view, while the father is alive the partition can be effected after the death of the mother similarly when the father is dead but the mother is alive it does not necessarily follow that the desired partition should be effected. But what has been said previously under the text of *Gautama* 'after the death of the father' and what is to be said hereafter in the original, the principal cause is the father's death, and the mother's death is of secondary importance. So 'the period after the death of the father' by reason of the existence or non existence of the mother is two fold, but it is understood to mean 'authoritative'

and is not in conflict with what is to be said hereafter. Just as, in the first division three are included, so in it there are two, therefore the partition during his life and after his death is two fold and allowed by law but not the third of the motherless. It is not so according to the text of Manu, 'they are dependent while the parents are alive' (M VIII-1171), the cause arises after the death of both, being in conformity to the unity of a sentence in the original as laid down, how can it be then interpreted that way? Always to avoid the unavoidable contradiction that is to arise, even on the husband and wife having a right to a share according to Āpastamba but she has no such right to become separate like the sons, by reason of being the better half, she is everywhere in a company, the sense has been previously given she being accordingly placed on an equal level with the sons, possesses the proprietary right like them. The sons have no right to claim partition during the life time of the mother and have no right to dispossal at their will by reason of want of ownership. This is the meaning of Manu. That is also the meaning of the original 'after the death of the parents'. Śamkha also means the same when he says, "Those whose father is alive are dependent, so are they who have mother."

'On the death of the father, let the sons divide the father's property, when the sinless father is alive they have no ownership,' Devaḥ,

Or let 'while the father is alive', be alone it relates to the self-acquired property. Similarly when the mother is alive it relates to her personal property. Further the result of 'the parents' will be later on explained. By this, the statement of Hardatta (to the effect) that there is no right of partition *inter se* between the husband and wife by reason of Āpastamba having said nothing about it previously, is refuted. So on the death of the father and even if the mother is alive there arises a right to partition, but not at the option of the mother nor has she a right to claim it. This is to be borne in mind. To sum up while the father is alive, there are three periods of partition, with the consent of the father, two, 'when', two. In the first, at the instance of the father, in the last two, at the instance of the son. The allotment is equal everywhere. In the first case, the parents have equal shares, similarly in other two cases but it is when no separate property is given to the mother. If the separate property is given, then her share is half. On the death of the father, there are two periods by reason of the existence or non existence of the mother at the instance of the sons, the partition is equal. In the first case the mother has also an equal share. The mother's will is never the governing factor, nor does partition take place at her instance. It relates to the movable property, pure self acquired property and the *an astral mixed with self acquired property*. In the pure ancestral property there is a peculiarity which is to be dealt with later on, there the mother has no share. Thus we have partition of the property that has descended unmixed with the earning of the father, mixed with such earnings and pure earning of the father, on the death of the father. We have also self acquisitions of two kinds (1) ante nuptial and (2) post nuptial. In the first case we have the rule relating to it under

the text

In the self acquisitions of the father, the sons are not entitled to claim a partition without the wish of the father, but in the house and land properties which have descended, the father and sons have equal shares: he may not divide his self-acquisitions among his sons without his wish" Gautama. "In the ancestral property whether immovable or moveable the father and son are declared to possess equal ownership. But the lost ancestral property which the father has recovered with his effort and what he has acquired by his special knowledge or heroism is the exclusive property of the father. Let him make a donation of it at his option and then enjoy what is left out, in its substance, the sons are declared to be equal sharers." In these quotations from Brishaspati, by suggesting the sole participation of the sons with their father, then in the texts showing the shares of others as for instance he makes allotments' II 115 'after the father' (II 123) and laying down the share of the mother, there is nothing which entitles the mother to claim partition. It is proper because the word 'partition' means a separate allotment by virtue of the original right arising from co ownership with another and a separate share therein to be determined along with that of others who have equal proprietary right. The daughters in-law etc have no proprietary right in the property of the father in law by birth owing to the absence of the prior relationship. If one says that there will be future relationship, it will be stretching the rule to its extreme limit by reason of the foreign birth. No relationship arises by marriage because after marriage she becomes a companion, nor by the death of her husband, because he is not her progenitor but in reality her right is obstructed by the proprietary right of the son otherwise by reason of the mutual partition of the property of the soulless among the wives of his uncles or grand sons, there will be a conflict with (the rule laid down in) the original 'by the different fathers' (II 120). A mother has, therefore, no share in the property acquired by the father before marriage. "Shall take equal share" applies where there is pre-existing ownership by reason of 'take', but where there is no such pre-existing right, the words 'give' 'acquire' etc are appropriate. According to others, when there are immovable properties of both kinds, the sons have ownership by reason of the possibility of the confusion to be stated here after.

The post nuptial earning of the father is also two fold, movable and immovable. As to that, some say that under 'although the mother may take an equal share' both are equally meant, but by reason of the connection of the text 'to whom no separate property has been given' (II 115), it applies to the moveable property only. It follows that it does not depend on the maker and partition but on the relinquishment (donation),* this is the unanimous opinion. So when one is not given any property by the husband or the father in law specifically, she may take the share, on saying this, it means that when she is given a share specifically 'by so and so' it becomes her share and she gets no other. If it is equal to the son's share, that which was given before also becomes

*It may also mean. "Regarding the case and declaration, it depends on relinquishment

and is not in conflict with what is to be said hereafter. Just as, in the first division three are involved, so in it there are two, therefore the partition during his life and after his death is two fold and allowed by law but not the third of the motherless. It is not so, according to the text of Mann, they are dependent while the parents are alive' (M VIII-1171), the cause arises after the death of both, being in conformity to the unity of a sentence in the original as laid down, how can it be then interpreted that way? Always to avoid the unavoidable contradiction that is to arise, even on the husband and wife having a right in a share according to Āpastamba but she has no such right to become separate like the sons, by reason of being the better half, she is everywhere in a company, the sense has been previously given she being accordingly placed on an equal level with the sons, possesses the proprietary right like them. The sons have no right to claim partition during the life time of the mother and have no right to disposal at their will by reason of want of ownership. This is the meaning of Manu. 'That is also the meaning of the original 'after the death of the parents'. Śaṅkha also means the same when he says, "Those whose father is alive are dependent, so are they who have mother."

'On the death of the father, let the sons divide the father's property, when the sinless father is alive they have no ownership,' Devaia,

Or let 'while the father is alive', be alone. it relates to the self-acquired property. Similarly when the mother is alive it relates to her personal property. Further the result of 'the parents' will be later on explained. By this, the statement of Nardatta (to the effect) that there is no right of partition *inter se* between the husband and wife by reason of Āpastamba having said nothing about it previously, is refuted. So on the death of the father and even if the mother is alive there arises a right to partition, but not at the option of the mother nor has she a right to claim it. This is to be borne in mind. To sum up, while the father is alive, there are three periods of partition, with the consent of the father, two, 'when', two. In the first, at the instance of the father, in the last two, at the instance of the son. The allotment is equal everywhere. In the first case, the parents have equal shares; similarly in other two cases - but it is when no separate property is given to the mother. If the separate property is given, then her share is half. On the death of the father, there are two periods by reason of the existence or non existence of the mother at the instance of the sons, the partition is equal. In the first case the mother has also an equal share. The mother's will is never the governing factor, nor does partition take place at her instance. It relates to the movable property, pure self acquired property and the an estral mixed with self acquired property. In the pure ancestral property there is a peculiarity which is to be dealt with later on where the mother has no share. Thus we have partition of the property that has descended unmixed with the earning of the father, mixed with such earnings and pure earning of the father, on the death of the father. We have also self acquisitions of two kinds (1) ante nuptial and (2) post nuptial. In the first case we have the rule relating to it under

the text

In the self acquisitions of the father, the sons are not entitled to claim a partition without the wish of the father, but in the house and land properties which have descended, the father and sons have equal shares : he may not divide his self acquisitions among his sons without his wish " Gantama. "In the ancestral property whether immovable or moveable the father and son are declared to possess equal ownership. But the lost ancestral property which the father has recovered with his effort and what he has acquired by his special knowledge or heroism is the exclusive property of the father. Let him make a donation of it at his option and then enjoy what is left out, in his absence, the sons are declared to be equal sharers " In these quotations from Brishaspati, by suggesting the sole participation of the sons with their father, then in the texts showing the shares of others as for instance he makes allotments 'II 115 'after the father' (II 123) and laying down the share of the mother, there is nothing which entitles the mother to claim partition. It is proper because the word 'partition' means a separate allotment by virtue of the original right arising from co ownership with another and a separate share therein to be determined along with that of others who have equal proprietary right. The daughters in law etc have no proprietary right in the property of the father in law by birth owing to the absence of the prior relationship. If one says that there will be future relationship, it will be stretching the rule to its extreme limit by reason of the foreign birth. No relationship arises by marriage because after marriage she becomes a companion, nor by the death of her husband, because he is not her progenitor but in reality her right is obstructed by the proprietary right of the son. otherwise by reason of the mutual partition of the property of the sonless among the wives of his uncles or grand sons, there will be a conflict with (the rule laid down in) the original 'by the different fathers' (II 120). A mother has, therefore, no share in the property acquired by the father before marriage. "Shall take equal share" applies where there is pre-existing ownership by reason of 'take', but where there is no such pre-existing right, the words 'give' 'acquire' etc are appropriate. According to others, when there are immovable properties of both kinds, the sons have ownership by reason of the possibility of the confusion to be stated here after.

The post nuptial earning of the father is also two fold, movable and immovable. As to that, some say that under 'although the mother may take an equal share' both are equally meant, but by reason of the connection of the text 'to whom no separate property has been given' (II 115)), it applies to the moveable property only. It follows that it does not depend on the maker and partition but on the relinquishment (donation)* this is the unanimous opinion. So when one is not given any property by the husband or the father in law specifically, she may take the share, on saying this, it means that when she is given a share specifically 'by so and so' it becomes her share and she gets no other. If it is equal to the son's share, that which was given before also becomes

*It may also mean "Disregarding the case and declaration, it depends on relinquishment."

partible. If it is in excess, the equal is partible and the excess is (considered) gifted one. Hence if it was given without consent by reason of the absence of the power (of gift) on account of the existence of the son's ownership, the adjustment can be made by giving from the equal share of the son but it is not by right. If it is less, in order to avoid unequal division with other mother, it should be equalised from the property to be partitioned. In the passage 'If given (the separate property) half should be given' means that the given property should be made a part of the share so that it may be equalised from the other shares. Similarly in the passage 'the mother should get an equal share', it means that she should be made separate owner along with the son. Here the immovable property being not subject to partition should not form part (of her share) by reason of the commentator's use of such expressions 'at the pleasure of the husband' 'jewels and pearls' 'at the pleasure of the father' 'immovable and bipeds.'

"A female is said to be always at liberty in selling and giving the sandāyika (personal property) even if it is immovable. On the death of her husband a female can spend her husband's inheritance (वर्तुष्य) at her option; she must protect it while he is alive or otherwise spend it for the family purposes. A soleless widow under the guidance of the elders, keeping the bed of her husband unsullied, should enjoy it while controlling her passions till her death; the reversioners shall get it after her." From the passages of Kātyāyana (it follows) that while the sons are alive, just as in the ancestral property so in his self-acquired immovable property, there is no ownership by reason of the right arising in future; in such a state there is no possibility of gift and sale. There is lightness (derogation) when it is repeated that there is no gift or sale in such cases; otherwise the difficulties will arise on breaking the prohibition laid down.

Gautama says "others also get a share following the share allotted to the sons and the unmarried daughters,..." Here avoiding the term 'similar' which is a synonym of 'equal', using 'just similar' a synonym of 'proportionate' and including the married daughters in the category show this meaning, by reason of the maintenance of the unmarried girls who are in the category of 'just similar' from the movables only. 'Just similar' by being a class of sharers is distinguished. Angirā and Vyāsa say, "In the absence thereof, the mother is an equal sharer with the sons; their mothers are equal co-sharers and the maidens are entitled to a

apavādam, an exception ; मातृ āma, declared मातुः mātuh, the mother's ; दुहितरः duhitaraḥ, the daughters ; शेष इषाम, the residue ; अणाय riṣāt, after paying the debts.

8. It has been declared that sons may part the effects after the death of their father and mother. The author states an exception, in regard to the mother's separate property; "The daughters share the residue, of their mother's property, after payment of her debts."

Balambhatta's gloss.

8. He explains the relevancy ; 'the mother', he explains it by repetition.

Mitākṣarā.

मातुर्धनं दुहितरोविभजेत् । अणायत्वेयं मातृहृतर्थापाकरणायशिष्टं अतश्चणै-
स्समंन्यूनवा या मातृधनपुता विभजेदपि यस्य विधयः । ६ ॥

मातुः mātuh, the mother's, धनम् dhanam, the property ; दुहितरः duhi-
taraḥ, daughters विभजेत् vibhajeta, should distribute, अणाय riṣāt, after
the debts, शेषम् śeṣam, what has remained ; मातृहृत-अणाय कर्त्तव्यशिष्टम् mātū-
hṛta riṣāpāka, kṛtvāśiṣṭam, what has remained after paying debts of the
mother, अतः ataḥ, hence, च cha, and, अथवम् athavam, equal to
her debts, न्यूनम् nyūnam, less, वा vā, or, मातृधनम् mātūrdhanam, the mother's
effects, पुताः putāḥ, the sons, विभजेत् vibhajeta, may divide ; इति iti,
such ; अथ asya, of this, विधयः vidhayaḥ, purport.

9. Let the daughters divide their mother's effects remaining over and above the debts ; that is, the residue after the discharge of the debts contracted by the mother. Hence, the purport of the preceding part of the text is, that sons may divide their mother's effects, which are equal to her debts or less than their amount.

Balambhatta's gloss.

9. 'Mothers', he proceeds to explain the subject under discussion ; 'contracted by the mother', by this ; "A son may be youngest of the senior wife and eldest of the junior wife, doubt arises how should there be a partition ? The eldest son gets a bullock as an additional share and others get the shares according to their mothers, after deductions of

the bullock allotted to the eldest, The eldest born from the senior wife gets 16 bullocks and the rest get the share according to their mother. It is a settled rule. When the sons are born of the wives of the same class without any speciality, the seniority does not depend on the mother but on the birth. Even of (those born of) a Brahman woman, the seniority is determined by the birth, the seniority of the twins in the womb is also from the birth' (Mann IX 122-126) "Those who are born of the same caste by one father from different mothers, get the shares through their respective mothers" Vyāsa

"Those step-sons who are of equal castes but born from one father should be allotted shares according to their mother" Brihaspati,

"Those who are of the same caste though several are entitled to get their respective shares",

All these are said to relate to some other period. The exposition by Vyāsa and others without the additional share, in derogation to the equal partition supporting the unequal division is set aside by it by reason of its perversity, because it arises from the ignorance of the meaning of the smṛiti.

Then in the exception, 'residue after the payments of debts' is needless, the reply is that taking thereof in the mother's share is not for one's own use, by reason of the unity of the sentence with 'in their default' and being the subject of the daughters' failure there is (ultimate) accomplishment (of possession). He therefore says, 'therefore' means by reason of laying down the special rule. The purport is that in pursuance of the exception in the mother's property after the payment of debts while the daughters are alive, by reason of the advantage of that relationship, even when it is not partible by the sons by the non applicability of the exception on account of no equal or less remaining after payment of the debts and by reason of no right existing even when the daughters are alive, the general rule alone applies as the remainder after payment of the debts is not partible while the daughters exist, similarly the equal or less is not divisible by reason of its being necessarily payable, so he says.

Mitīkṣarā

एतदुक्तं भवति । मातृकृतमृणं पुत्रैरेवापाकस्वीयं न दुहितृभिः श्रद्धा-
यशिष्टं तु यत्र दुहितरोद्गीधुरिति । युक्तं चेत् । पुमान्पुत्रोऽधिके श्रुते स्त्री भवत्य-
धिकं स्त्रिया इति स्वयययानां दुहितृषु बाहुल्यात् स्त्रीधनं दुहितृगामि । पित्रधनं पुत्र-
गामि पित्रयययानां पुत्रेषु बाहुल्यादिति । १० ॥

एतदुक्तं, this, उक्तम् uktam, meant, said, यत्रैवे bhavati, is, मातृकृतम्
mātrīkṛtam, contracted by the mother, ऋणम् ṛṇam, the debts, पुत्रैः
putraih, by the sons, एव eva, only, स्वाकारणीयम् aśākarāṇīyam, must be

discharged, न ना नोत्, दुहितृभिः duhitribhīḥ, by the daughters नृणांशिनम् rñāvaśṣṭam remaining above her debts तु तु, but, धनम् dhanam, property, दुहितरं duhitarah, the daughters, गृहीतुः grāhīyuh, should take, इति itī so, युक्तम् yuktam fit, proper, च चा, and, एतत् etat, this, पुमान् puman, the male issue, पुत्रः putrah, of the man, अधिकं अधिके adhike śūkre, if the seed be more, स्त्री stri a female issue, अधिकं अधिके adhike, if the contribution be more, स्त्रियां striyāḥ, of the woman, इति itī, thus, स्वययवयानाम् stryavayavānam the female portions, दुहितृषु duhitṛiṣu, in the daughters, बाहुल्यात् bāhulyāt, because they abound, स्त्रीधनम् stri dhanam, the woman's property, दुहितृणामि duhitṛ gāmi, goes to the daughters, पित्रधनम् pitṛ dhanam, the father's estate, पुत्रगामि putra gāmi, goes to the sons, पित्रवयवयानाम् pitṛavayavānām, portions of the father, पुत्रेषु putreṣu, in sons, बाहुल्यात् bāhulyāt, because they abound, इति itī, so

10, The meaning is this A debt, incurred by the mother, must be discharged by her sons, not by her daughters, but her daughters shall take her property remaining above her debts, and this is fit, for by the maxim, "A male child is procreated if the seed predominate, but a female if the woman contribute most to the foetus," the woman's property goes to her daughters, because portions of her abound in her female children, and the father's estate goes to his sons, because portions of him abound in his male children.

Balamphatta's gloss

10 'It' the meaning is that they shall take it subject to payment of the debt so he supports the textual contradictions with the arguments borrowed from other sūtras 'Fit', 'the seed' is connected with both, by this a doubt that may arise to the contrary etc is set aside Just as after the death (of the father) the sons etc make partition and while he is alive it is effected at their instance, so while the mother is alive, even on the proprietary right subsisting from the birth, the daughters have no right to claim partition, nor can it be effected at the mother's option by reason of there being no text (to that effect) but whatever she gives becomes that of theirs (donees') He, therefore says, 'by the parents to him (11 123) It was said previously that the wife's property is indivisible, but by the inherent force of the text, it relates to the subject of partition at the instance of the husband, so there is no conflict

Middlerd

तत्र च गौतमेन विशेषोद्दिष्टः । स्त्रीधनं दुहितृणां प्रदानाप्रतिष्ठितानां

चेति । अस्वार्थः । प्रत्ताप्रत्तासमवायेऽप्रत्तानामेव स्त्रीधनम् । प्रत्तासु चाप्रतिष्ठिता-
प्रतिष्ठिता समवायेऽप्रतिष्ठितानां चेति । अप्रतिष्ठिता निधना ॥ ११ ॥

तत्र tatra, in that subject, च cha, and, गौतमेन Gautamena, by
Gautama, विशेष विशesh a special rule, दर्शितः darśitah, = propounded,
स्त्रीधनम् stri dhanam, a woman's property, दुहितृणाम् duhitṛiṇāṃ, belongs
to the daughters, अप्रत्ताणाम् apratīṇāṃ, that are not given in marriage,
अप्रतिष्ठितानाम् apratiṣṭhitānām, that are not provided for च cha, and, इति
iti, so, अथ asya, of this, अर्थः arthah the meaning प्रत्ताप्रत्तासमवाये pratīṣṭhā
apratīṣṭhā samavāye, in the competition of the married and the unmarried
अप्रत्ताणाम् apratīṇāṃ, of those that are unmarried, एव eva, only, 'indeed',
स्त्रीधनम् strīdhanam, the wife's property प्रत्तासु pratīṣṭhāsu, amongst the
married ones, च cha, and, अप्रतिष्ठिता प्रतिष्ठितासमवाये apratiṣṭhāṭhā
pratīṣṭhāṭhā samavāye, in the competition of the unprovided for and the provided
for, अप्रतिष्ठितानाम् apratiṣṭhitānām, of those that are unprovided for, च
cha, and, इति iti, so, thus, अप्रतिष्ठिताः apratiṣṭhīṭhāḥ, unprovided for,
निर्धना nirdhanāḥ, means poor, devoid of wealth, destitute of wealth

11. On the subject [of daughters] a special rule is propounded by
Gautama. = A woman's property goes to her daughter, unmarried,
or unprovided " His meaning is this, if there be competition of married
and unmarried daughters, the woman's separate property belongs to
such of them as are unmarried, or, among the married, if there be
competition of endowed and unendowed daughters, it belongs exclusively
to such as are unendowed, and t'is term signifies 'destitute of wealth'

Balambhatta's gloss

11 Keeping this in view he lays down a special rule 'There'
means 'on the subject of the daughters' Of the daughters' being
as applicable to all generally, it so applies the term 'of the unmarried'
is useless, how can it be used in a special sense? His meaning', (pratīṣṭhā)
married, (upratīṣṭhā) unmarried, (pratīṣṭhīṭhā) endowed, wealthy, (apratīṣṭhāṭhā)
unendowed, poor, the meaning is that there is no meaningless-
ness, by reason of denoting, the special rule 'Exclusively' is to be
repeated at both places.

Mitākara

दुहितृणां मातृधनमुद्यावशिष्टं कौ शुद्ध्यादित्यत आह-

ताभ्यऋतेऽन्वयः ॥ ११७ ॥

दुहितृणां दुहितृर्भावे, in the absence of daughters ; मातृधनम् mātri-dhanam, the mother's property ; शेषावशिष्टम् śeṣāvashīṣṭam, remaining after paying the debts ; कः kaḥ, who ; गृहीयात् grīhiyāt, should take ; इति itī, so ; अतः ataḥ, hence , आह āha, says ; तम् tabhyaḥ, them ; सते ste, in the absence of ; अन्वयः anvayaḥ, the issue

12. In answer to the question, who takes the residue, of the mother's goods, after payment of, her debts, if there be no daughter? the author adds, "And the issue succeeds in their default".

Bālabhāṭṭa's gloss.

12 There is a doubt; 'daughter.....who'; the general rule relates to another subject and does not apply here, having explained the word meaning, he proceeds to explain the meaning of the sentence.

Mitākṣarā

तस्यैतदुहितृभ्योविना दुहितृणामभावे अन्वयः पुत्रादिपुंल्लिपात् । एतच्च विम-
जेत् सुताः पित्रोश्च र्थमित्यनेनैव सिद्ध स्पष्टार्थमुक्तम् । १३ ॥

तस्यः tābhyāḥ, them ; दुहितृभ्यः duhitṛibhyāḥ, the daughters ; विना vinā, in the absence ; दुहितृणाम् duhitṛiṇām, of daughters ; अभावे abhāve, in the absence of , अन्वयः anvayaḥ the issue ; पुत्रादिः putrādīḥ, sons etc. ; गृहीयात् grīhiyāt, should take , एतच्च etat, this ; च cha, and ; विमजेत् vimajet, should distribute ; सुताः sutāḥ, the sons , पित्राः pitrāḥ, the parents , अन्वयम् ānvayam, after , इति 'so, so , अनेन anena, by this , एव eva, indeed ; सिद्धम् siddham, was proved right ; स्पष्टार्थम् spaṣṭārtham, expressly ; उक्तम् uktam, has been declared.

13. On failure of daughters, that is, if there be none, the son, or other male offspring, shall take the goods. This, which was right under the first part of the text, ("Let sons divide equally both the effects and the debts;") is here expressly declared for the sake of greater perspicuity.

Bālabhāṭṭa's gloss.

'Of the daughters', it is already pointed out ; 'and this' ; 'accomplished' (siddham) means 'accomplished from the meaning', it means that it also relates to that subject like it.

END OF SECTION III.

SECTION IV

पितृद्रव्याविरोधेन यदन्यत्स्वयमर्जितम् ।

मैत्रमौद्वाहिकं चैव दायादानां नतद्भवेत् ॥ ११८ ॥

क्रमादभ्यागतं द्रव्यं हृतमप्युद्धरेत्तु यः ।

दायादेभ्योन तद्दादाद्विदया लब्धमेव च ॥ ११९ ॥

पितृ द्रव्य-अविरोधेन pitiḥ dravya avirodhena, without detriment to the father's estate, यद् yad whatever, अन्यत् anyat, else, स्वयम् svayam, by himself, अर्जितम् arjitam, earned मैत्रम् maistram, as a present from a friend, औद्वाहिकम् andvāhikam, as a nuptial present, च cha, and, एव eva, indeed, दायादानाम् dāyādānām, of the co heirs, न na, not, तद् tad, that, भवेत् bhavet, should be, क्रमाद् kramād, through succession, अभ्यागतम् abhyāgatam, come, द्रव्यम् dravyam, property हृतम् hṛtam, taken away, अपि api, even though, उद्धरेत् uddharot, would recover, तु tu but, य yaḥ, who, दायादेभ्यः dāyādebhyaḥ, to the parceners, न na, not, तद् tad, that, दायाद् dadyāt, should give, विदया vidyayā, by learning, by science, लब्धम् labdham, acquired, एव eva, indeed, च cha, and

1. The author explains what may not be divided. "Whatever else is acquired by the coparcener himself, without detriment to the father's estate, as a present from a friend, or a gift at nuptials, does not appertain to the co-heirs. Nor shall he, who recovers hereditary property, which had been taken away, give it up to the parceners nor what has been gained by science"

Balambhatta's gloss

1. 'Not liable to partition', only with a view to strengthen partition there is, therefore, relevancy of the subject, this is the meaning. Here the words 'or also' are in the sense of 'optional' there are other readings as (chavaiti) 'and also' and (cha) 'and'. The word 'pitrī' (father) is ekaccha for the reason given above

Mitalpard

मातापित्रोर्द्रव्याविनाशेन यत्स्वयमर्जितं मैत्रं मित्रसकाशापसत्त्वं औद्वाहिकं

विवाहलब्ध दायादानां प्राप्त्यां तच्च भवेत् । क्रमात्पितृकृमादायात् यत् किञ्चित् द्रव्यं
अन्यैर्हृतमसामर्थ्यादिना पित्रादिभिरनुद्धृतं यः पुत्राणां मध्ये इतराभ्यनुज्ञयोरस्ति
तदायादेभ्योऽप्रादिभ्येन दद्यात् । उद्धर्तव्यं गृहीयात् । २ ॥

माता पित्रोः mātā pitroh, of the father and mother द्रव्याविनाशेन dravya-
vināśena, without any detriment to the goods of, यत् yat, whatever, स्वम्
svayam, by himself, अर्जितम् arjitam, acquired, मैत्रम् maitram, of a friend
(means), मित्रसाक्षात् mitra sakṣāt, from a friend, यद् yad, whatever,
लब्धम् labdham, is obtained, यौद्वादिकम् yauddhādikam, pertaining to marriage
(means) विवाह-लब्धम् vivāhalabdham, obtained in a marriage, दायादानाम्
dayādānām, of the coheirs (means), भ्रातृणाम् bhātrūṇām, of the
brethren, तद् tad that, न na, not, भवेत् bhavet, should be, क्रमात् kramāt,
through succession (means), पितृकृमात् pitṛ-kramāt, through succession
from ancestors, आपातम् āpatam, come, यत् किञ्चित् yat kiñchit, whatever,
द्रव्यम् dravyam, wealth, property, अन्यै anyaiḥ, by others, हृतम् hṛtam,
taken away, असामर्थ्यादिना asāmāthyādina, through inability or for any
other cause, पित्रादिना pitrādibhiḥ, by the father etc, अनुद्धृतम् anuddhritam,
not recovered, यः yaḥ, whoever, पुत्राणामध्ये, utrāṇāmmadye, from among
the sons, इतराभ्यनुज्ञया itarābhy-anujayā, with the permission, with the
acquiescence of the others, उद्धरति uddharati, recovers, तद् tad, that,
दायादस्य dāyādasya, to the co-heirs, भ्रातृदि-वा bhātrādibhyaḥ, to the
brethren etc, न na, not, दद्यात् dadyāt, should give. उद्धर्ता uddhartā, the
person recovering, एव eva, only, indeed, गृहीयात् grīhiyāt, should take

2 That which had been acquired by the co-parcener him-
self without any detriment to the goods of his father or mother;
or which has been received by him from a friend, or obtained by
marriage, shall not appertain to the co-heirs or brethren. Any
property, which had descended in succession from ancestors, and
had been seized by others, and remained unrecovered by the
father and the rest through inability or for any other cause, he,
among the sons, who recovers it with the acquiescence of the
rest, shall not give up to the brethren, or other co-heirs; the
person recovering it shall take such property,

Balambhatta's gloss.

■ 'Mother', he contrasts it with 'detriment', 'without detriment to
the goods', 'that', whatever is understood by reason of such reading in

the original. If there is (any) 'other' as the reading in the original, 'other' should be considered as understood. It means the property different from that of the father. He details the different kinds "by... received from a friend etc", he uses the imperative mood without necessity. 'Shall not appertain' appertains, similarly in the following passage. 'Descended in succession' is the opening part of the second verse, he now explains 'why was it not recovered by the elders?' he replies 'through inability'. If there is no acquiescence, then it is partible. 'Of the rest', he gives the purport, the recoverer. Similarly in the succeeding passage. He then gives a special rule.

Māhara

तत्र क्षेत्रे तुरीयांशमुद्धर्ता लभते शेषं तु सर्वेषां सममेव । यथाह शङ्खः । पूर्व
नष्टो नृ योभूमिमेकमुद्धरेत्कमात् । यथाभागं लभन्तेऽग्रे इति न तु तुरीयक-
मिति । ३ ॥

तत्र tatra, there, क्षेत्रे kṣetre, if it be land, तुरीयांशं tūrīyāṁśam, the fourth part, उद्धर्ता uddhartā, the recoverer, लभते labhate, obtain, शेषं śeṣam, the remaining, तु tu, but, सर्वेषां sarveṣāṁ, of all, समम् samam, equally, एव eva, indeed, यथा yathā, as, आह āha, says, शङ्ख śaṅkhaḥ, Śaṅkha, पूर्वम् pūrvam, formerly, नष्टान् naṣṭān, lost, तु tu, but, य yath, who, भूमिम् bhūmim, land, एक ekam, a single one, चेद् ched, if, उद्धरेत् uddhareṭ, would recover, क्रमात् kramāt, in succession, यथाभागम् yathā-bhāgam, according to his due allotment, लभन्ते labhante, obtain, अन्ये anye, others, दाया datvā, giving, अंशम् aṁśam, part, तुरीयकम् tūrīyakam fourth, इति iti, so

14 If it be land, he takes the fourth part, and the remainder is equally shared among all the brethren. So Śaṅkha ordains "Land, (inherited) in regular succession, but which had been formerly lost and which a single (heir) shall recover solely by his own labour, the rest may divide according to their due allotments, having first given him a fourth part."

Bālabhāṭṭa's gloss

3 'And in the land', here 'and' is in the sense of 'but', the proper reading is 'and there in the land'. 'Amongst them' means 'in their connection'. Among all (means) 'among the recoverer and the rest'. 'according to their due allotments' means after giving a quarter share to the recoverer the remaining (3) should be distributed by all along with him according to their shares. 'In order' being meaningless in connec-

tion with 'recovery' and by reason of the unity of the sentence, he fills up the gap by 'in order' the first part of the verse, 'inherited'

Mitākṣara.

अमादभ्यागतमिति शेषः । ४ ॥

अमाद् bramād, through succession, अभ्यागतम् abhyāgatam, come, inherited, इति iti, this, शेषः śeṣah, remains, is understood

4 In regular succession] Here the word 'inherited' must be understood.

Mitākṣara

तथा विद्यया वेदाध्ययनेनाध्यापनेन वेदार्थव्याख्यानं वा यज्ञस्य तदपि दायादेभ्यो न दद्यात् । अजकपय गृहीयात् । ५ ॥

तथा tathā, similarly, विद्यया vidyayā, by learning, वेदाध्ययनेन vedādhya-
yanena, by studying the Vedas, अध्यापनेन adhyāpanena, by teaching,
वेदार्थ-व्याख्यानं vedārtha-vyākhyāna, by expounding the meaning of the
Vedas, वा vā, nor, यद् yad, whatever, लब्धम् labdham, obtained, तद् tad,
that, अपि api, also, दायादेभ्य दā,ādabhyah, to the coheirs, न no, not,
दद्यात् dadyāt, should give, अजकः arjakah, acquirer, एव eva, only, गृहीयात्
grihīyāt, should take

5. He need not give up to the co-heirs, what has been gained by him through science, by reading the Scriptures or by expounding their meaning; the acquirer shall retain such gains.

Balambhatta's gloss

4 and 5 He explains the fourth quatrain, he explains 'similarly' by connecting it with 'only' (eva), by 'science alone', by reason of the non absence of any proof and being in unison with the text of other smritis he gives its three meanings. 'By reading the scripture' he means by reason or its being principal. He gives the meaning, 'that also', this is the reading which is approved of. This and others by the inherent force of the terms, viz 'father', 'himself' and 'kinsmen' etc, relate to the earning of one of the brothers in the complete partition, similarly the text of Narada relating to the (earnings by the) exploits should be understood. Later on, the earnings made in this way will be, however, considered

Mistake

अत्र च पितृद्रव्याविरोधेन यत्किञ्चित्सवमर्जितमिति सर्वत्रशेषः । अत्र च पितृद्रव्याविरोधेन यन्मैत्रमर्जितं पितृद्रव्याविरोधेन यदौद्वाहिक पितृद्रव्याविरोधेन यत्क्रमादायातमुद्धृतं पितृद्रव्याविरोधेन विद्यया लब्धमिति प्रत्येकमभिसम्बध्यते । तथा च पितृद्रव्याविरोधेन प्रत्युपकारेण यन्मैत्रम् । आसुरादि विवाहेषु यल्लब्धम् । तथा पितृद्रव्यव्ययेन यत्क्रमायातमुद्धृतं तथा पितृद्रव्यव्ययेन लब्धया विद्यया यल्लब्धं तत् सर्वं सर्वैर्भ्रातृभिः पित्रा च विभजनीयम् । ६ ॥

अत्र *atra*, here, च *cha*, and, पितृद्रव्याविरोधेन *pitṛidravyaāvirodhena*, without detriment to the father's property, यत्किञ्चित् *yatkinchit*, whatever, स्वयम् *svayam*, by himself, अर्जितम् *arjitam*, acquired, इति *iti*, this, सर्वत्र *sarvatra*, everywhere, शेषः *śeṣah*, understood, अतः *atah*, hence, thus, च *cha*, and, पितृद्रव्याविरोधेन *pitṛidravyaāvirodhena*, without detriment to, the paternal estate, यद् *yad*, whatever, मैत्रम् *maitrām*, from a friend अर्जितम् *arjitam*, acquired, पितृद्रव्याविरोधेन *pitṛidravyaāvirodhena* without, detriment to the paternal estate, यद् *yad*, whatever, औद्वाहिकम् *andāhikam*, nuptial, पितृद्रव्याविरोधेन *pitṛidravyaāvirodhena*, without any detriment to the paternal property, without the father's expenses यत् *yat*, whatever, क्रमादुच्चायातम् *kramādāyātām*, inherited property, उद्धृतम् *uddhṛitam*, recovered, पितृद्रव्याविरोधेन *pitṛidravyaāvirodhena*, without any detriment to the father's property, not by the father's expenses विद्यया *vidyayā* by learning, यद् *yad*, whatever, लब्धम् *labdhām*, acquired इति *iti*, so प्रत्येकम् *pratyekam*, with each member of the sentence, अभिसम्बध्यते *abhisambhadyate*, is connected, तथा *tathā*, similarly च *cha*, and, पितृद्रव्याविरोधेन *pitṛidravyaāvirodhena*, conferred at the charge of the patrimony, प्रत्युपकारेण *pratyupakāreṇa*, as the return of an obligation, यद् *yad*, which, मैत्रम् *maitrām*, obtained from a friend, आसुरादि विवाहेषु *āsuraādivivāheṣu*, in the marriage concluded in the form termed *Āsura* or the like, यद् *yad*, whatever, लब्धम् *labdhām*, is obtained, तथा *tathā*, similarly, पितृद्रव्यव्ययेन *pitṛi-dravya vyayena*, by the expenditure of the father's goods, यत् *yat*, whatever, क्रमादायातम् *kramādāyātām*, hereditary, उद्धृतम् *uddhṛitam*, recovered, तथा *tathā*, similarly, पितृद्रव्यव्ययेन *pitṛi drāvya vyayena*, at the expense of the ancestral wealth, लब्धया विद्यया *labdhayā vidyayā*, by the learning gained by, यद् *yad*, whatever, लब्धम् *labdhām*, obtained, तत् *tat*, that, सर्वम् *sarvām*, all, सर्वैः *sarvaiḥ*, by all, भ्रातृभिः *bhrātṛibhiḥ*, brothers, पित्रा *pitṛā*, by the father, च *cha*, and, विभजनीयम् *vibhajaniyam*, should be divided

6 Here the phrase "any thing acquired by himself, without detriment to the father's estate", must be everywhere understood and it is thus connected with each member of the sentence, what is obtained from a friend, without detriment to the paternal estate, what is received in marriage, without waste of the patrimony what is redeemed, of the hereditary estate, without expenditure of ancestral property, what is gained by science without use of the father's goods. Consequently, what is obtained from a friend, as the return of an obligation conferred at the charge of the patrimony, what is received at a marriage, concluded in the form termed Asura, or the like, what is recovered, of the hereditary estate, by the expenditure of the father's goods, what is earned by science, acquired at the expense of ancestral wealth, all that must be shared with the whole of the brethren and with the father.

Bdāmbhatta's gloss

6 Though the said explanation devoid of adjectives or with all adjectives is common, yet he shows it in favour of his view with the object to bear on the subject 'Here and etc', 'here and' in the original text he gives another explanation Anything (kinshit) there is another reading, 'only' ('evam' or 'eva') The third is with a view to be in conformity with the text of Manu He means the remaining portion after distributing all the properties obtained from a friend etc as laid down in the text by reason of their being not partible 'And therefore' he gives the result on its being understood everywhere 'consequently' the same is explained in an opposite way, or the return of the obligation caused at great hostility or to the detriment and consequently made In the Brāhma form of marriage there is no detriment to the patrimony under the text he therefore says '... from the Asura form of marriage, 'with the father', therefore they are mentioned divisible among all 'Must be shared', therefore there is a relevancy of the subject of partition He clearly explains the meaning of the sentence, 'not similarly', but what is acquired without detriment to the patrimony such as gift from a friend, etc is not partible

Mitaksra

तथा पितृद्रव्याविरोधेनेत्यस्य सर्वशेषत्वादेव पितृद्रव्याविरोधेन प्रतिग्रहलभ्य
मिति विभजनीयम् । अस्य च सर्वशेषत्वाभावे मैत्र मौद्रादिकमित्यादिना लभ्यन्म् ॥३॥

tथा tsāh, similarly, thus ; पितृद्रव्याविरोधेन pitṛi dravyā-virodhena

without detriment to the father's estate, इति iti thus, अथ अथा, this (phrase), सर्व-शेषत्वात् sarva-acṣatvāt, because of its being understood every where अत्रात्रा, here, विद्रव्यविशेषेन pitr-dravya-viśodhena without detriment to the father's estate, प्रतिग्रह लब्धम् pratigraha labdhām obtained by simple acceptance, इति iti, so विभजनीयम् vibhajaniyam, should be divided, अथ अथा, this, च चा, and सर्वशेषत्वाभावे sarva-acṣatvā-bhāve, if it were not understood with every member of the text; मैत्रम् maitram, present from a friend, सुद्वहिकम् sudvāhikam a dowry received at a marriage, इत्यादिना ityādinā, by this and the like, लब्धव्यम् labdhavyam, should be obtained

7. Thus since the phrase "without detriment" to the father's estate" is in every place understood, what is obtained by simple acceptance, without waste of the patrimony, is liable to partition. But, if that were not understood with every member of the text, presents from a friend, a dowry received at a marriage, and other particular acquisitions, need not have been specified.

Balambhatta's gloss

7 It is not only understood with every member of the text but, it is understood with every thing declared impartible by the texts of other smṛitis by reason of the implication of the gift from friends etc. Similarly the gift from friends etc. are divisible, so are others also 'Patrimony' some (are of opinion) that it is also not (partible), in that case even on getting at the right principle as regards the gift from a friend etc. and the things (declared impartible) under the other smṛitis by reason of the unsettled principle as regards the acquisition by acceptance (will) it is difficult to determine the correct principle there it may be, therefore said, to be implied by it, he says, or on determination of the true principle in the case of the gift from a friend etc. the same principle applies with equal force 'Patrimony', somewhere the reading is without 'not' is appears to be proper and in conformity with the mode of explanation by the commentator, there is no use in repeating the meaning of the sentence the fact that it is understood in the succeeding one only is not independent, 'but' (kincha) is with the object of that meaning; the purport is already given and it is proper

According to others the reading is 'not thus' (na tathā) even then, it is understood in the succeeding clause: it means 'not independently'. The meaning is just as by reason of detriment to the patrimony being understood everywhere and being understood at the end of friendly gift etc. under the text the friendly gift etc. obtained to the detriment of the patrimony is divisible, similarly the earnings from the acceptance of gift being other than friendly gift etc. acquired at the expense of the patrimony, are

indivisible. What he means is that the fitness for divisibility arises from the earnings being made at the cost, though independently, by reason of that (to the detriment of the patrimony) being understood. It is not so, by reason of its being in conflict with what follows in the book and by reason of its not keeping pace with the natural tenour thereof.

It is to avoid the defect of *īdāpatti** on saying 'let it be so'; if it be said to be understood with it (every member of the text) there will be independence. He, therefore, says to strengthen the above said view for (fear of) the possibility of its being different from the friendly gift etc. under the maxim of 'Brāhmaṇa vasiṣṭha' †. On that being understood by reason of the inherent force of the word etc., whatever is earned without detriment to the patrimony is indivisible. Though it follows from the members of the sentence, yet generally like similar acquisition from the acceptance of gift, similar friendly gift etc. are proved to be indivisible; the enumeration of the same again, is useless; it is his meaning. It is not the subject of the maxim of 'Brāhmaṇa Vasiṣṭha'; it comes into operation when there is a reason but the application is elsewhere. Here in the present case there is no difference of the subject (dealt with); otherwise he doubts the applicability.

Mitākṣh.

अथ पितृद्रव्यविरोधेनापि यन्मैत्रादितन्त्रं तस्याविभाज्यत्वाद्यन्मैत्रादिवचन-
मित्यर्थयदित्युच्यते । तथा सति समाचारविरोधः विद्यालब्धे नारदवचनविरोधश्च ॥
कुटुम्बं विभूयाद्भ्रातृभ्यां विद्यामधिगच्छतः । मायं विद्याधनाद्यस्मात्सलभेताभ्युतोऽपि
सन्निति तथा विद्याधनस्याविभाज्यस्य लक्षणमुक्तं कात्यायनेन । परमकोपयोगेन विद्या
प्राप्तान्यतस्तु या । तथा तन्त्रं धनं यत्तु विद्याप्राप्तं तदुच्यते इति । ८ ॥

अथ *atha*, now; पितृ-द्रव्य विरोधेन *pitrīdravya-virodhena*, at the expense of the patrimony; अपि *api*, even; यद् यद्, whatever; मैत्रादि *maitrādi*, gifts from a friend and similar gifts; तस्य *tasya*, of that; अविभाज्यत्वात् *avibhājyatvāt*, owing to its not being liable to partition, owing to its being exempt from partition; मैत्रादिवचनम् *maitrādi-vachanam*, mention of, or enumeration of a present from a friend and similar other gifts; इति *iti*, that; अर्थयद् *arthavad*, is pertinent; इति *iti* so; उच्यते *uchyate*, it is

* It is a party's statement which turns out favourable to the opposite side. It is like admission. See *Vāchaspatya*.

† माह्व्यपरिवाजकन्याय The maxim of the *Brahmans* and the *mendicants*. In such a sentence as माह्व्यः भोजयिष्याः परिवाजकाश्च, the separate mention of the latter, who are really included in the former term, merely emphasises their position as a special part of the general body. It is thus the exact parallel of the रोपणीवद् न्याय and of the माह्व्यवतिष्ठ न्याय *Jacob*

alleged, तथासति tathā sati, if that be the case, समाचार विरोधः samāchāra virodhah, inconsistency with the received practice of unerring persons, विद्यालब्धे vidyālabdhe, as regards what is obtained by learning or science, नारद वचनविरोधः Nārada-vachana virodhah, contradiction with a passage of Nārada, च cha, and, कुटुम्बम् kutumbam, the family, विभूयाद् bibhūyāt, would maintain, भ्रातुः bhṛātuh, of a brother, य yah, who विद्याम् vidyām learning, अधिगच्छताम् adhigachchātah, (of a brother) who is studying science acquiring learning, भागम् bhāgam a part विद्याधनम् vidyā dhanāt, of the wealth gained by science, स sah, he, कमेत labheta would obtain, असुत असुतम्, ignorant अपि api, even, though, सत् san, being, remaining, इति iti, so, तथा tathā, similarly, विद्याधनस्य vidyā dhanasya, of wealth earned by learning, न विभागस्त्वविभक्त्यायाः, of what is not to be divided, लक्षणम् lakṣanam, the definition, उक्तम् uktam, is said, कालापनेन kātyāyanena, by kātyāyana, परमहोपपदेन parabhakti upayogena, while receiving a foreign maintenance, विद्या vidyā, science, learning, प्राप्तं prāptam, acquired अन्यतः anyatah, acquired from a stranger, तु tu, but, यत् yā, which, तथा tayā, by that, लब्धम् labdham, obtained, धनम् dhanam, wealth, यत् yat, which, तु tu, but, विद्या-प्राप्तम् vidyā-prāptam, obtained by learning, उक्तम् uktam, that, उच्यते uchyate, is said, इति iti, so

8 But, it is alleged, the enumeration of amicable gifts and similar acquisitions is pertinent, as showing that such gains are exempt from partition, though obtained at the expense of the patrimony. Were it so, this would be inconsistent with the received practice of unerring persons, and would contradict a passage of Nārada "He, who maintains the family of a brother studying science, shall take, be he ever so ignorant, a share of the wealth gained by science." Moreover, the definition of wealth, not partible, which is gained by learning, is so propounded, by Kātyāyana. "Wealth, gained through science which was acquired from a stranger while receiving a foreign maintenance, is termed acquisition through learning."

Balambhatta's gloss

8 'But', 'also' (api) is in the sense of inclusion of the preceding, 'exempt from partition', by being indivisible it is in the fifth form of declension in the sense of reason in the form of result; it

means 'to support it'; the reading 'for exemption from partition (avibhāgyatvāya)' does not require elucidation. 'Received practice of unerring persons' means 'not contrary to the practice sanctioned by the society of the educated people.'

When the usage (practice) is weak by reason of the text that *anṛti** etc are each stronger than the following ones, it is improper. The reply is in the negative by reason of not explaining the meaning. As for example, the annulment is an obstruction in the way; non-annulment is a preferable rule; under it a weak rule does not annul another weak (rule) but its operation comes into play when there is a conflict and no opportunity for its application. The conflict arises by two different rules at one place. But such is not the case here. When there is accomplishment (of an object) by non-annulment, the annulment is not proper; under this rule, the text as regards a friendly gift should be interpreted in accordance with what we say; there is, therefore, no room for non-application. In this way under the rule 'to those who are afraid of meaninglessness', the annulment is unsuited; in short if the interpretation be accepted according to what I state, it offends the customary law observed by educated men,

Not only does it offend the rules of the society but the gains of science falling under the category of the friendly gift are against the *śūlitis* also. 'In the gains of sciences' means a share in them; he explains it. If the brother of one who is acquiring learning supports his family, though illiterate and ignorant, by being devoid of the Vedic-learning, he gets a share in the earnings made with the learning acquired by him; there is another reading, '*anṛta*' (senseless in place of '*āśrta*', illiterate). Here by stating the reason for sharing the earnings on supporting the family (of the acquirer), sharing of the gains of science is conditional but not natural by reason of being a brother. If the object of the original text is that the wealth in the shape of sciences acquired anyhow is in reality indivisible, it contravenes the condition attached by Nārada. It follows that the divisibility or indivisibility thereof is not natural; but it is indivisible if acquired without detriment to the patrimony and divisible when acquired to the detriment thereof. It is contradictory in form but in conclusion it is in conformity with the reason assigned by Nārada. In the original the '*pitrī*' (patrimony) is *upalaksana* (synecdoche). If the object of Nārada is that the allotment of a share in the gains of sciences is natural, the condition attached thereto is meaningless. So the learning acquired in any way is not divisible in itself; otherwise on the indivisibility thereof depending on the acquisition without detriment to the patrimony, the indivisibility is proper i. e. the statement as to the division thereof is irrelevant.

By 'illiterate' it is implied that in the case of an illiterate man, there

* See the Pūrva Mīmāṃsā p. 114 of Vol. XXVII and p. p. XVIII-XX of vol. XXVIII of S. B. H.

an allotment of a share, if it (learning) is acquired to the detriment of the patrimony, in the case of a literate man he is entitled to it by reason of possessing it and possessing learning. Kātyāyana therefore, says 'A man who is literate shall nowhere share the gains of science with the illiterate, but a literate man shall share them with those who are equally or more learned.' Vaidya means literate it is an exception to the established truth arrived at as to indivisibility it will be clear later on. By this, the foolish (Manda's) statement that there is a contradiction between Nārada and Kātyāyana is refuted by reason of the definition of indivisibility given by Kātyāyana and the subject (thereof). The commentator has also said to the same effect, otherwise the qualifying clauses have no bearing. In the same way the commentators's conflict as to other than gains of science with Nārada etc., should be reconciled.

It lays down an extraordinary principle* in connection with the divided brother. But there is a rule that the friendly gifts are always impartible and in the established truth the particulars have been specified as exceptions so there is no conflict. 'Similarly learning' 'foreign' means by eating the cooked rice etc. of persons other than the father, foreign other than the father so the earnings gained from learning acquired without detriment to the patrimony from a different person are gains of science, but not others and as such they are indivisible. Any other acquisition is, therefore, not a gain of science and is divisible. It means that the conflict by reason of the intention of Kātyāyana with the meaning is obvious. Therefore even without the conflict with Nārada's text by the conflict with Kātyāyana's text, the impossibility of the meaning and the absence of sense on that (without detriment to the patrimony) being not understood, the defect of the meaninglessness is well established.

Mitākara

तथा पित्रद्रव्याविरोधेनेत्यस्य भिन्नवाक्यत्वे प्रतिग्रहलब्धस्याविभाज्यत्वमाचारविद्वदमापद्येत । ६ ॥

tathā, similarly, पित्रद्रव्याविरोधेन pitrā dravyāvivirodhena, without detriment to the father's estate इति iti, so, अथ अथा, of this, भिन्नवाक्यत्वे bhinna vākyaṭve, if it be a separate sentence, प्रतिग्रह लब्धस्य pratigraha-labdhasya, obtained by acceptance, अविभाज्यत्वम् avibhājatvam, being exempt from partition, आचार-विद्वद् āchāra viruddham, contrary to established practice, आपद्येत āpadyet, would be

9. Thus if the phrase "without detriment to the father's estate", be taken as a separate sentence, any thing obtained by

* See at p XXI of vol XXVIII of S B H for its explanation

more acceptance would be exempt from partition, contrary to established practice.

Balambhatta's gloss

9 He points out another defect, 'thus] 'acceptance', by reason of 'without detriment to the patrimony', any thing obtained without detriment to the patrimony under the previous rule as acceptance of gift made for invisible purpose, charity and donation, even if earned without any detriment to the patrimony, becomes impartible, this is contrary to the practice of the elders. The friendly gifts, the subject of all smritis acquired with or without detriment to the patrimony, being twofold, the divisibility of the acceptance of gift (pure and simple) is, therefore, in conformity with the practice (custom). The substance is that there is nowhere prohibition laid down by the smritis as to this, like the earnings made by officiating as a priest or teaching.

Mitākṣara

पतदेव स्पष्टीकृतं मनुना । (अ० ६ म० २०८) अनुपगमन् पितृद्रव्यं अमेयं यदुपाजयेत् । दायादेभ्यो न तदद्याद्विद्यया लब्धमेव चेति । १० ॥

पतद etad, this, एव eva, very, indeed, स्पष्टीकृतम् spaṣṭī kṛitam, is made evident, मनुना manunā, by Manu अनुपगमन् anupagaman, without ruining, without using, पितृद्रव्यम् pitṛ dravyam, father's wealth, अमेयं āramena, by his labour, यद् yad, whatever, यथाजयेत् uparjayet, would earn, दायादेभ्यः dāyādebhyaḥ to the coparceners, न na, not, तद् tad, that, दद्याद् dadyāt, should give, विद्यया vidyayā, by means of learning, लब्धम् labdham, obtained, एव eva, indeed, च cha, and, इति iti, thus. }

10 This (condition, that the acquisition be without detriment to the patrimony,) is made evident by Manu "What a brother has acquired by his labour, without using patrimony, he need not give up to the co-heirs, nor what has been gained by science".

Mitākṣara

अमेयं सेवया युद्धादिना । ११ ॥

अमेयं āramena, by labour, सेवया sevayā, by service, युद्धादिना yuddhādina, by war and the like

11. By labour. By science, war, or the like

Balambhatta's gloss

10 and 11 'This' means the friendly gift etc earned without any detriment to the patrimony, without injury' means 'without using' here the meaning of preceding part of the stanza is clear. By change of declension in 'without injury', it comes to this that a person who does not use the patrimony in both the acquisitions made by his learning and by other means mentioned previously shall not share them with his co sharers, from this, it follows that what is earned without detriment to the patrimony in the shape of loss of the father's money, by means of learning or labour is indivisible when such is the case with the wealth acquired by learning which falls under the category of the friendly gifts etc, a *forte* the same applies to the friendly gift by implication (upalaksana)

In Manu (IX 208) 'whatever is obtained by one's effort shall not be given without his will' The reading of the last part of the verse is to the effect that whatever is earned with labour being desirable as for example friendly gift, shall not be divisible among brothers if he (the acquirer) is unwilling to do so. This reading of Medhatithi and Kalpataru is not proper by reason of giving rise to the defect of the conflict with many smritis 'aham taṁ', the later reading is still more improper or it may relate to the ancestral property. Having thus stated the remainder of the brothers' shares 'without injury', as said, should be understood, 'etc' conveys agriculture etc. By the two terms 'without detriment to the patrimony' etc, the earnings of a brother as the friendly gifts etc shall not be shared by others, for the word 'father' includes other co sharers (this shows that they are not earnings of the father and others. This practice (custom) is based on brotherly affection or personal skill, or seen elsewhere similarly, it is founded on it.

In 'whatever is on the father' (IX 204) the meaning of Manu is this. From the text of Manu, 'he should protect the sons (of the father) like the father' IX 108, the younger brothers have a right in the property of the elder like that of the father and son with this difference that in the paternal property even the illiterate have a share therein but in the elder brother's acquisition, only the literate brothers are entitled to it. It appears so from the phrases such as 'in the death of the father' 'elder brother', 'of the younger brothers', and 'protectors of learnings', (IX. 204). It is, therefore, refuted that whatever earned jointly becomes the property of those who are other than joint (i.e. separate) as said previously, by reason of the uselessness of 'whatever'.

Madhvar's

मनु पित्रद्रव्यापिरोधेन यन्मेवादितम्यं द्रव्यं तद्विभाग्यमिति न व्यवह्यम् ।
विभागद्रव्यमाधात् । यद्येन लभ्यं तत्तत्स्विय मान्यस्येति प्रसिद्धतरम् । मातिपूर्वकम्
प्रतिषेधः १२ ॥

ननु nanu, not indeed, is it not, विदुःस्याविरोधेन pītṛi dravyāvirodhena, without detriment to the father's property; यद् yad, what; मैत्रादिस्तद् matrādi-laddham, obtained as a present from a friend, and similar presents; द्रव्यम् dravyam, wealth; तद् tad that, अविभाज्यम् avibhājyam, should not be divided; इति iti, so; न वक्तव्यम् na vaktavyam, it should not be said; विभाग-प्राप्ति-प्रमाणात् vibhāga prāpti-abhāvāt, since there is no ground for the supposition of a partition; यद् yad, which; येन yena, by whom, स्वस्तु labdham, acquired, तद् tat, that; तस्य tasya, belongs to that person (the acquirer); एव eva, indeed, only; न na, not; अन्यस्य anyasya, of any other person; इति iti, so, this; प्रसिद्धतरम् prasiddha-taram, = well-known; प्राप्ति-पूर्वकं prāpti-pūrvakam implying the possible supposition of the contrary, = चा, and, प्रतिषेधः pratishedhaḥ, the denial.

12 Is it not unnecessary to declare that effects obtained as presents from friends, and other similar acquisitions made without using the patrimony, are exempt from partition: since there was no ground for supposing a partition of them? That what is acquired, belongs to the acquirer, and to no other person, is well known: but a denial implies the possible supposition of the contrary.

'Bālabhāṭṭa' gloss

12 No, it is not proper; in the ancestral and paternal property on the son's having a proprietary right from the birth and on his having no such right in the earnings of his brother, it is common-place knowledge that whatever a brother gets as a friendly gift etc. = his (earning), does not form part of the partible property and is not divisible. He, therefore, says with a view to show the irrelevancy of the prohibition relating to it "Is.....patrimony"; he gives a reason for the absence of a rule (for partition); 'that', because etc.: the meaning is that there is no proprietary right (in the earning) of another. He assigns another reason for the absence of the rule; 'having', 'and' (cha) is in the sense of 'because.'

Mitākṣara

अत्र कश्चिदित्थं प्राप्तिमाह । यत्किञ्चित्पितरि प्रेते घनं ज्येष्ठोधिगच्छति । भागोऽथोपसां तत्र यदि विद्यानुपालिन इति ज्येष्ठायाः कनिष्ठोऽवामभ्यसां वा पितरि प्रेते अप्रेते वा यद्योपसां धर्मीयसां चेति व्याख्यानेन पितरि सत्यसति च मैत्रादीनां विभाज्यत्वं प्राप्तं प्रतिपिप्यते इति १३ ॥

अत्र atra, here, कश्चित् kaśchit, some body, इत्थम् ittham, thus, प्राप्तम् prāptam, grounds for supposing a partition, आह Aha, states; यत्किञ्चित् yat kiñchit, whatever, पितरि pitari, if the father, मृते prete, be dead, धनम् dhanam, wealth, ज्येष्ठे jyēṣṭhah, the eldest, अधिगच्छति adhi gachchati, obtains, भागं bhagāh, a share, यवियसाम् yaviyaśām, of the younger ones, तत्र tatra, there, यदि yadi, if, विद्यानुपाधिना vidyānupādīnah, such as have duly cultivated science, इति iti, so, ज्येष्ठे jyēṣṭhah, the eldest, वा vā, or, कनिष्ठे kanīṣṭhah, the youngest, वा vā, or, मध्यमा madhyamah, the middle one, वा vā, or, पितरि मृते अप्रते वा pitari prete अप्रते vā, whether the father be dead or not dead, यवियसाम् yaviyaśām, of the younger ones, वरियसाम् variyaśām, of the older ones, च cha, and, इति iti, so, व्याख्यानेन vyākhyānena, by explanation, by interpreting, पितरि सति असति pitari sati asati whether the father be alive or not, च cha, and, मैत्रादीनाम् maitradīnām, of the present from a friend and similar other presents, विभाग्यत्वं vibhāgyatvam, being liable to partition, प्राप्तम् prāptam, being supposed, प्रतिषिद्धं pratiṣidhate, is denied, इति iti, so.

13. Here a certain writer thus states grounds for supposing a partition. By interpreting the text, "After the death of the father, if the eldest brother, acquire any wealth, a share of that belongs to the younger brothers provided they have duly cultivated science", in this manner, if the eldest, youngest, or muddlemost, acquire property before or after the death of the father, a share shall accrue to the rest, whether younger or older, grounds do exist for supposing friendly presents and the like to be liable to partition, whether or not the father be living that is accordingly denied.

Balambhatta's gloss

13 In order to find fault with the view of one who holds that even the affectionate gifts etc are partible, he gives his view 'Here some one', he cites the text of Manu which favours partition, 'whatever', 'acquire' obtain, 'there', in the wealth, 'provided' if youngest, 'cultivated science' means 'patron of learning or learned men', there is another reading 'follower of learning'. From the following quatrain it follows that if they are illiterate, their earnings shall then be not divided.

So says Gauṭama (XXVIII-28) "A literate shall not share his earnings with the illiterate (brothers) willingly." Nārada also says

"A literate person shall not allot a share of his wealth willingly to the illiterate (brothers) provided he has acquired it without using the paternal money".

Kātyāyana has already been cited. By explaining this text, he says that they all point to the divisibility of the friendly gifts etc ; 'or the eldest' ; the term 'eldest' includes all the three ; the term 'youngest' includes all the elder brothers. 'After the death' [even before the death, so two periods are fixed. If any brother other than the eldest obtains wealth anyhow, he shall have to allot a share therefrom to other brothers either before or after the father's death provided they are literate ; in this sense, the friendly gifts etc. are, of course, divisible. (This rule) is prohibited by 'the paternal money' (the last proviso).

Mitākṣarā

तदसत् । न ह्यत्र प्राप्तस्य प्रतिषेधः । किंतु सिद्धस्यानुवादोऽयम् । लोकसिद्ध-
स्यैवानुवादकान्येव प्रायेणास्मिन्प्रकरणे दृश्यमानि १४ ॥

tad tad, that ; असत् asat, is erroneous ; न na, there is not ; हि hi, since ; अत्र atra, here ; प्राप्तस्य prāptasya, of what might be supposed, प्रतिषेधः pratishedhaḥ, denial ; किंतु kintu, but ; सिद्धस्य siddhasya, of what is demonstratively true ; अनुवादः anuvādaḥ, recital ; अयम् ayam, this ; लोकसिद्धस्य loka-siddhasya, of what is notorious to the world ; एव eva, only, indeed ; अनुवादकानि anuvādakāni, recitals ; एव eva, indeed ; प्रायेण prāyeṇa for the most part ; अस्मिन् asmin, in this ; प्रकरणे prakaraṇe, section, under (this) head.

14. The argument is erroneous ; since there is not here, a denial of what might be supposed ; but 'the text is a recital of that which was demonstratively true : for most texts, cited under this head, are mere recitals of that which is not notorious to the world.

Bālabhāṭṭa's gloss.

14. The original is an exception to the impartibility of the friendly gifts etc established from the old custom but not in the nature of prohibition, so that there may be a necessity of the rule. Keeping this purport in view, he by removing the doubt refutes that view. 'The argument is erroneous,'] 'here' in the matter of the affectionate gift, it means not only here but elsewhere also, by the first 'eva' (only) the distinction is made with the rule of the Scripture and by the second 'eva' (only), the distinction is made with the prohibition. He says with a view to state otherwise some where ; 'generally'.

Bhāṭikāra

अथवा समवेतेस्तु यत्प्राप्त सर्वे तत्रसमांशिन इति प्राप्तस्यापवाद इति सन्तुष्यतु भवान् । अतश्च यत्किञ्चित्पितरि प्रेते इत्यस्मिन्वचने ज्येष्ठादिपदाविषयता प्राप्तिरिति व्यामोहमार्ग अतोमैत्रादिवचने पितुः प्रागुच्यं वा विभाज्यत्वेनोक्तस्य यत्किञ्चित्पितरि प्रेते इत्यस्यापवाद इति व्याख्येयम् १५ ॥

अथवा *athavā*, or , समवेतैः *samavetsaiḥ*, in concert , तु *tu*, but , यत् *yat*, what , प्राप्तम् *prāptam*, acquired सर्वे *sarve*, all , तत्रात्रा, in that acquisition , समांशिनः *samāṁśinah*, partakers of equal shares , इति *iti*, so, thus , प्राप्तस्य *prāptasya*, to what is suggested , अपवादः *apavādaḥ*, an exception , अयम् *ayam*, this , इति *iti*. so considering , considering it as , सन्तुष्यतु *santuṣyat*, may be satisfied , भवान् *bhavaṁ*, you अतः *ataḥ*, hence , च *cha*, and यत्किञ्चित् *yat kinchit*, whatever , पितरि प्रेते *pitari prete*, when the father is dead ; इति *iti*, so , अस्मिन् *asmīn*, in this , वचने *vachane*, passage , ज्येष्ठादि-पदाविषयता *jyēṣṭhādīpadāvīśaya*, from an indefinite import of the word 'eldest', प्राप्तिः *prāptiḥ*, to deduce the suggestion , इति *iti*, this , व्यामोह-मार्गम् *vyāmoha mātram*, a mere error , अतः *ataḥ* therefore , मैत्रादिवचनैः *maitrādī vachanaiḥ*, from texts concerning friendly gifts and the rest , पितुः प्रागुच्यं वा *pituhprāgūchyam* before or after the father (so his death) विभाज्यत्वेन *vibhājyātvena*, as being liable to partition , उक्तस्य *uktasya*, of what is spoken , यत्किञ्चित् *yatkinchit*, whatever , पितरि प्रेते *pitari prete*, when the father is dead , इति *iti*, this , अस्या *asya*, to this , अपवादः *apavādaḥ*, an exception , इति *iti*, so , व्याख्येयम् *vyākhyeyam*, should be interpreted

15 Or you may be satisfied with considering it as an exception to what is suggested by another passage, "All the brethren shall be equal sharers of that which is acquired by them in concert' and it is therefore, a mere error to deduce the suggestion from an indefinite import of the word "eldest" in the text before cited (§13) That passage must be interpreted as an exception to the general doctrine, deduced from texts concerning friendly gifts and the rest, that they are exempt from partition, both before the father's death and after his demise

Bālabhāṭya's gloss

9323

15 Let it be a prohibition , the same result is obtained from other

texts (also), but not by the above said mode (alone) : he says so on the authority of the maxim of 'तुष्टु दुनवः' (let a wicked man be satisfied)*. 'Or'; he cites a text from Brihaspati; 'by all in concert', it is plural to include all. He, therefore, says, 'all'; 'there', in the wealth; here is also no proof; so he says, 'therefore' by reason of the result arising from thy (opponent's) obstinacy. 'Eldest etc.'; he means as there is no reason for inappropriateness the authority (proof) is clear. He says the same, 'error'; what will be the result of the established principle; so he says; 'therefore' means by reason of the possibility of thy (opponent's) above-said meaning. 'Of the father', death is understood; it is to distinguish it from indivisibility; 'of the above cited', of the affectionate gift; by 'it' is meant 'by this'. On the death of the father, the younger brothers get shares in the earnings made by the older brother from the friendly gifts etc. provided they are literate; it is what he means. So if the elder brother earns wealth by learning etc. acquired without detriment to the patrimony, the younger brothers get shares therein provided they are engaged in acquiring knowledge; so say Kalpataru and Medhatithi. So also it should be understood to be an exception to the above said-rule laid down by Kātyāyana.

Mitākṣarā.

तथान्यदप्यविभाज्यमुक्तं मनुना : (अ. ६ सू. २१६) यत्नं वस्त्रमलङ्कारं कृतान्न-
मुदकं स्त्रियः । योगक्षेमं प्रचारं च न विभाज्यं प्रवक्षते इति ॥ १६ ॥

tathā tathā, similarly; अन्यद् anyad, other things; अपि api, also; अविभाज्यम् avibhājyam, exempt from partition; उक्तम् uktam, is said, मनुना manunā, by Manu; वस्त्रम् vastram, clothes; यत्नम् 'patram, vehicles यन्त्रालम् alankāram, ornaments; कृतान्नम् kṛtānuam, prepared food; उदकम् udakam, water, स्त्रियः striyah, women; योग-क्षेमं yogakṣemam, sacrifices, and pious acts; प्रचारम् prachāram, a common way; न na, not; विभाज्यम् vibhājyam, to be divided; प्रवक्षते prachakṣate, they say, are declared.

16. Other things exempt from partition, have been enumerated by Manu, "Clothes, vehicles, ornaments, prepared food, women, sacrifices and pious acts, as well as the common way, are declared not liable to distribution.

* The maxim is used where even on admitting the untenable position of an opponent, another defect can not be cured.

Bālabhalla's gloss

16. He sets aside the deficiency, 'other things'] there is another wrong reading 'atha anyat', by 'als.' (api) 'Wealth acquired by one becomes his own self acquisition, similarly, gifts made to a friend, a bridegroom, or a guest. This is the substance, what is obtained by a guest out of respect. 'Are declared'] 'books', the reading according to Yama (Manda) by reason of the approval by the commentators, Kaṭyāyana and Medhātithi etc. is to be disregarded.

Mitākṣra

धृतानामेव वस्त्राणामविभाज्यत्वं यद्येन धृतं तत्तस्येव । पितृधृतानि तु पितृ-
कृत्य विभजतां आद्यभोक्त्रे दातव्यानि । यथाह बृहस्पतिः । वस्त्रालङ्कारशय्यादि पितृ-
र्यवहनादिकम् । गन्धमास्येः समभ्यर्च्य आद्यभोक्त्रे समर्पयेदिति । अभिनवानि तु
वस्त्राणि विभाज्यान्वेव ॥

यतानाम् dhṛtānām, of those that are used or worn, एव eva, only, indeed, वस्त्राणाम् vastrāṇām, of clothes, अविभाज्यत्वम् avibhājyātvaṁ being not distributed, यद् yad, which, येन yena, by whom, धृतम् dhṛitam, worn, तद् tad, that, तस्य tasya, belongs to the same one, एव eva, the very, the same, पितृधृतानि pitṛdhṛtāni, those that had been worn by the father, तु in, but, पितृकृत्यं pitṛ kṛtvam, after the father, विभजताम् vibhajatām, by brethren parting; आद्यभोक्त्रे śāddhabhoktre, to the person who partakes of the food at the obsequies, दातव्यानि dātavyāni, should be given, यथा yathā, as, आह āha, directs, बृहस्पतिः bṛhaspatiḥ, Bṛhaspati, वस्त्रालङ्कारशय्यादि vastrāṅkārā śayyādi, clothes, ornaments, bed and other articles, पितृ pitṛh, the father's, यद् yad, which, वाहनादिकम् vāhanādikam, vehicle and the like, गन्धमास्ये gandha mālyaiḥ, with fragrant drugs and wreaths of flowers समभ्यर्च्य samabhyarchoya, after worshipping them, पर्याज्यं śāddhabhoktre, to the person partaking of the food at the obsequies (of the funeral repasts), समर्पयेत् samarpayet, should give, इति iti, so, अभिनवानि abhinavāni, new, तु tu, but, वस्त्राणि vastrāni, clothes, विभाज्यानि vibhājyāni, are subject to distribution, एव eva, indeed

17. Clothes, which have been worn, must not be divided. What is used by each person, belongs exclusively to him; and what had been worn by the father, must be given by brethren parting after the father's decease, to the person who partakes of food at his obsequies as directed by Brāhaspati, "the clothes and ornaments, the bed and similar furniture, appertaining to the

father, as well as his vehicle and the like, should be given, after perfuming them with fragrant drugs and wreaths of flowers, to the person who partakes of the funeral repast " But new clothes are subject to distribution.

Balambhatta's gloss

17 He explains 'clothes' etc in order, 'which have been worn' etc] in the original text, the singular is used to indicate the same species, by this, the unity of clothes, vehicle, water is meant, the clothes should be of equal price not very precious, it refutes the view of Medhatithi and Kalpataru by reason of the qualifying clause to the object in view 'Worn clothes and ornaments' from Kātyāyana makes it common to both With this object in view, he says, 'of the worn only' by this a distinction is made with the unworn it is in connection with the sons, 'what'; it is also well known, He says in connection with the father, 'father', after father's death, 'after', by this, it is suggested that if partition took place during his life time, the father shall take them as his share 'Parting', under 'optionally of the ह्य in the nominative' (Panini II-3 71) is in the genitive case in the nominative sense That etc of the father' is connected with 'all that', 'etc' includes other paraphernalia it is the right of the person who partakes of the funeral repast in the worship 'The priest who partakes of the funeral repast' is in singular by reason of its applying to a class, it applies to the whole priestly class as represented by him He gives the result of the explanation, 'new'

Mitākṣara

यद्य वाहनमश्वशिविकादि तदपि यथेनाकृतं तत्तस्यैव विपमं तु यत्नयदेव ।
अद्यादीनां बहुते तु तद्विनयोपजीविना विमाज्यत्यमेव । येषम्येष विमाज्यत्ये ज्येष्ठस्य
(अ० ६ स्तो० ११६) अजायिकं सैकशकं न जातु विपमं भवेत् । अजायिकं सैकशकं
ज्येष्ठस्य विधीयते इति अनुस्मरणात् । १८ ॥

यत्नम् patram, vehicles (patram, means), वाहनम् vāhanam, vehicles;
अश्वशिविकादिśvaśibikādi, horses, litters etc, तद् tad, that, अपि api,
too, यद् yad, which, येन yena, by whom, आर्द्धम् Arddham, ridden, न
तत्, that; तस्य tasya, his, एव eva, on'y, indeed; पित्र्यम् pitryam, the
father's, तु tu but, वस्त्रवद् vastravad, like clothes, एव eva, indeed;
अद्यादीनाम् ādyādīnām, of horses and others, बहुते bahutvā, if these be

a number, तु tu, but तद्विक्रयपजीविनाम् tad vikraya upajivinām, among those who live by the sale of them विभज्यत्वम् vibhājyatvam, liability of being distributed, एव eva, indeed वैषम्येण vaiṣamyēṇa, owing to inequality, the member being unequal, विमाज्यत्वे vibhājyatve, in being distributed, ज्येष्ठस्य jyēṣṭhasya, belong to the eldest, अजाविकम् ajāvikam, a single goat, a single sheep, सैकाशम् saikaśapham, with a whole hoof, or with a uncloven hoof, न na, not, जातु jātu, indeed never, विरमम् viramam, an unequal, a single one भजेत् bhajet, should divide, अजाविकम् a, ā vikam, a goat or a sheep, सैकाशम् saikaśapham, an uncloven beast with a whole hoof, ज्येष्ठस्य jyēṣṭhasya, belong to the eldest, विधीयते vidhiyate it is prescribed that, इति iti, thus, मनुस्मरणात् manu smaranāt, because Manu has ordained

18. Vehicles] The carriages, as horses, litters, or the like Here also, that, on which each person rides, belongs exclusively to him. But the father's must be disposed of as directed in regard to his clothes. If the horses or the like be numerous, they must be distributed among co-heirs who live by the sale of them. If they cannot be divided, the number being unequal, they belong to the oldest brother, as ordained by Manu. "let them never divide a goat or sheep, or a single beast with uncloven hoofs a single goat or sheep belongs to the first-born."

Balambhatta's gloss

18 The synonyms of 'patra' (vehicle) are वाहन, वाह, युत्तं, पत्र, धोरण according Amara Sinha (II 8 58), similarly patra means both conveyance and leaf (Amar III 3 179), he supports it by quoting from the dictionary 'Carriage'], 'or the like, conveyances etc like the clothes should be given to 'the priest who partakes of the funeral repast' He gives a special case, 'of the horses', animals it is in the 6th form of declension in the sense of the nominative case as before, when they are many, they should be distributed amongst them all [Of the first born] it means that it falls to him as his share, here the unequal share is to make up the entirety but not for the unevenness Thus by giving one to him if the number is even, in order to make up the total of the shares they should be so allotted by them When there is an odd number by reason of the indivisibility thereof equally among all and by being not capable of conversion into money on account of the prohibition of sale, the shares should be

equally made and that which is over and above there in the shape of a horse etc., should be allotted to the eldest alone. If that is not practicable, the whole should go to the eldest. For example, the horses are four but the sons are three or five; in this case there is a glaring disparity. He means that if it be accepted, there will be conflict with the texts of many smritis, the same rule applies elsewhere. He cites an authority in support of indivisibility. 'A goat or a sheep'] It is *dwanda* compound to indicate 'a single of it, 'divide' allot; he assigns a reason: a goat', therefore etc. 'Patra' means any money entered in a document; "money entered in a deed and set apart for a charitable purpose, water, females and hereditary corrody." Kātyāyana.

'Let him disclose the (assets) after the sale of clothes and ornaments and payment of documentary debts and conversion of the prepared food into the unprepared'-Kalpataru citing from Brihaspati's smṛiti.

Mitākṣra.

अलङ्कारोऽपि ध्येयं धृतः स तस्यैव । अधृतः साधारणो विभाज्यप्येव । (मनु० अ० ६ श्लो० २००) पत्नी जीवति यः स्त्रीमिरलङ्कारो धृतो भवेत् । न तं भजेरन्वायादा भजमानाः पतन्ति तदिति ॥ अलङ्कारो धृतो भवेदिति विशेषेणोपादानादधृतानां विभाज्यत्वं गम्यते । १६ ॥

अलङ्कारः *alankārah*, ornaments; अपि *api*, too, यः *yah*, which; येन *yena*, by whom, धृतः *dhrītaḥ*, was worn; सः *sah*, that; तस्य *tasya*, his; एव *eva*, indeed; अधृतः *adhṛītaḥ*, which is not used, not worn; साधारणः *sādhāraṇaḥ*, is common; विभाज्यप्येव *vibhājyapya eva*, must be divided; पत्नी जीवति *patnyā jīvati*, while the husband is living; यः *yah*, which; स्त्रीभिः *stṛībhiḥ*, by women or wives; अलङ्कारः *alankārah*, ornaments; धृतः *dhrītaḥ*, used; भवेत् *bhavat*, would be; न *na*, not; तम् *tam*, that; भजेत् *bhajeran*, should divide; द्यादाः *dāyadāḥ*, heirs; भजमानाः *bhajasamānāḥ* if they divide, पतन्ति *patanti*, they fall, are degraded from their tribe; इति *iti*, so, अलङ्कारः *alankārah*, an ornament; धृतः *dhrītaḥ*, worn, used; भवेत् *bhavat*, if it would be; इति *iti*, so, thus, विशेषेणोपादानात् *viśeṣeṇa-upādānāt*, by the use of the epithet, by the condition specified; अधृतानाम् *adhṛītānām*, those that are unused, विभाज्यत्वम् *vibhājyatvam*, liability of being divided, गम्यते *gamyate*, is seen.

10.. The ornaments worn by each person are exclusively his. But what has not been used, is common and liable to partition. "Such

ornaments, as are worn by women during the life of their husband, the heirs of the husband shall not divide among themselves; they, who do so, are degraded from their tribe' It appears from the condition here specified ('such ornaments as are worn') that those, which are not worn, may be divided.

Balamhatta's gloss.

10 In the original it is, as usual, in neuter, he says with an object, 'ornament'] 'worn'], here everywhere 'bhrita etc.' is another reading, the meaning is the same. 'The unworn' is explained, 'in divisible' vibhājya is an incorrect reading, although under 'वर्तु, ईदृशं in comparison of two and division" (P V 3 57),* by *nipāta* it is correct only in the ablative case, but nowhere else. It may be asked similarly by dropping एत् obtained under "generally कृत् and व्युत् affixes" (P III-3-113)† how can vibhājya be formed? The reply is that it is correct by reason of its ending in a vowel under 'after vowel, वर्त्' (P III 1 97)‡ There is no difference of meaning by reason of laying down the prohibited, a root form of the verb is made causative, so under 'If a root ending in *ṣ* in the state devoid of *ṣ* being accusative, becomes nominative in the sense of non meditation' (I 3 67)§ (it is proper) by reason of the support given by *Hā ita*. But *nipātas* and other obstructions are not proper by reason of 'kn being unavoidable in 'nyat' and the absence of the support thereof. By this, the statement of Haridutta to the effect that the correct use of the term of 'vibhājya' in the *smṛiti* is doubtful, is refuted.

He cites Manu, 'in the husband' and by the women' are figures of synecdoche, therefore 'each person, is exclusively his' should be understood not against the preceding part of the book 'iti' means 'here', there is an authority for the special rule, 'ornament'], by this 'worn and similarly situated at the time of partition should not be allotted to shares to the sons', but she should put it on as a share of her husband. It follows as a matter of invisible inference that what a wife has put on during the life time of her husband, shall be indivisible after his death.

* See for farther elucidation at P 961 of vol I of Panini.

† See at P. 324 Ibid.

‡ See at P 383 Ibid.

§ See at P P 119 of vol I of Panini.

By this, the indivisibility thereof for all times is refuted, there is on the other hand degradation on appropriating it out of avarice for its beauty. By saying 'while living' there is nothing wrong in appropriation after death by another ; the statement of Yama is set aside-

Mitākṣra.

कृतान्नं तण्डुलमोदकादि तदप्यविभाज्यं यथासम्भवं भोक्तव्यम् । २० ॥

कृतान्नम् kṛtānnam, prepared food ; तण्डुल taṇḍula, boiled rice ; मोदकादि modakādi, sweetmeats etc ; तद् tad, that ; अपि api, too ; अविभाज्यम् avibhājyam, not to be divided ; यथासम्भवं yathā sambhavam, according to circumstances ; भोक्तव्यम् bhoktavyam, is to be used, consumed.

20. Prepared food, as boiled rice, sweet cakes, and the like, must be similarly exempted from partition. Such food is to be consumed according to circumstances.

Bālabhāṭṭa's gloss.

20 'Prepared food', here is no karmadhāraya by reason of the word 'kṛta' being useless, but it means 'made from eatable stuff' like 'rājadanta etc.," The word "anna" (eatable), is a compound word and means anything fit for it. 'Boiled rice and sweet cakes' mean the sweetmeat balls made thereof, 'and the like', cakes etc. ; 'according', but etc, similarly in the following.

उदकं उदकाभारः कूपोदि. तच्च विभक्तं मूल्यद्वारेण न विभाज्यं पर्यालोप-
भोक्तव्यम् । २१ ॥

उदकम् uḍakam, water ; तु ta but ; उदकाभारः uḍakābhārah a reservoir of water, कूपोदि kūṇādī, wells etc., तच्च tachcha, and that, विभक्तम् vibhaktam, unequal, (to the allotment of shares) , मूल्यद्वारेण mūlyā-dvāreṇa, by means of the value ; पर्यालोप par्यालोप, one by turns ; उपभोक्तव्यम् upabhoktavyam, should be used.

21. Water, or a reservoir of it, as a well or the like, being unequal (to the allotment of shares,) must not be distributed by means of the value ; but is to be used (by the co-heirs) by turns.

Bālabhāṭṭa's gloss.

21 'Unequal' by this, the division is suggested in equal allotment,

similarly in the following also for the said reason, he, lays down the mode of use, 'value' similarly in the following also

Mitākera

स्त्रियभद्रास्योविपमा न मूल्यद्वारेण विभाज्या पर्यायेण कर्म कारयितव्याः ।
अथव्यास्तु पित्रा स्वैरित्याद्याः समात्रपि पुत्रैर्न विभाज्याः । 'स्त्रीषु असंयुक्तासविभाग'
इति नीलमस्मरणात् । २२ ॥

स्त्रियाः striyah women, च cha, and, दारः dāsyah, women slaves ;
विपमा viśamāh, unequal (to the number of shares) न na, not, मूल्यद्वारेण
mūlya dvārena, by means of value, विभाज्याः vibhājyāḥ, should not be
distributed, पर्यायेण parāyena, in turns कर्म karma, work कारयितव्याः kārayi-
tavyāḥ, should be made to work, अथव्याः avaruddhāḥ, kept in concu-
binage, तु tu, but, पित्रा pitrā, by the father, स्वैरित्याद्याः svairinyādyāḥ,
adulteresses and others, समाः samāḥ, equal (to the shares), अपि api,
even though, पुत्रैः putraiḥ, by the sons, न na, not, विभाज्याः vibhājyāḥ,
be divided, स्त्रियुः striṣu in the case of women, संयुक्तासु saṃyuktāsu, that
were connected, अविभाग a vibhāgaḥ, no partition, इति iti, so,
नीलमस्मरणात् gautamaśmāranāt, because of the text of Gautama

22 The women or female slaves, being unequal (in num-
ber, to the shares) must not be divided by the value, but should
be employed in labour (for the co-heirs) alternately. But women
(adulteresses or others) kept in concubinage by the father, must
not be shared by the sons, though equal in number. for the text
of Gautama forbids it "No partition is allowed in the case of
women connected (with the father or with one of the co heirs)"

Balambhatta's gloss

22 By reason of mentioning 'slaves' out of fitness, he states a
special rule suggesting the result 'Women kept in concubinage' means
kept by the father, he defines them, 'adulteresses', by 'api' the unequal
is also included. He gives an authority in support of even their equal
number 'Women connected' means 'enjoyed' or 'kept', similarly the
other reading, it means that they should be maintained like mothers.
By the prohibition of the divisibility of the kept women, the married
females are *a fortiori* excluded, by this, the description thereof like the
female slaves given by Yama etc and the application of it to others
according to others are set aside, because both are included by reason of
ample authorities. It is (a rule) of equal application

Mītakṣa.

योगश्च क्षेमश्च योगक्षेमम् । योगशब्देनालब्धसामकारणं धौतस्मार्तान्नि-
साध्यमिष्टं कर्म लक्ष्यते । क्षेमशब्देन लब्धपरिरक्षणहेतुभूतं बहिर्वेदिदानतद्भागाराम-
निर्माणं पूर्तं कर्म लक्ष्यते । तदुभयं पैतृकमपि पितृद्रव्यविरोधार्जितमप्यविभाज्यम् ।
यथाऽलोकाक्षिः । क्षेमं पूर्णं योगमिष्टमित्याहुस्तत्त्वदर्शिनाः । अविभाज्ये च ते प्रोक्ते
शयनासनमेव चेति । २३ ॥

योगः *yogaḥ*, *yoga*, च *cha*, and ; क्षेमः *kṣemaḥ*, *kṣema* ; योगक्षेमम् *yogaḥ kṣemaṁ*, the conjunctive word *yoga kṣemaṁ*. योगशब्देन *yoga śabdēna*, by the word *yoga*; अलब्ध-साम-कारणम् *alabdha sāma kāraṇam*, the cause of obtaining something not already obtained धौत स्मार्तान्निषाध्यम् *śrānta smārta nni-sādhyaṁ*, to be performed with fire consecrated according to the Vedas and the law ; इष्टम् *iṣṭam*, sacrificial, कर्म *karma*, act ; लक्ष्यते *lakṣyate*, is denoted ; क्षेमशब्देन *kṣema śabdēna*, by the word *kṣema*, लब्ध-परिरक्षण हेतुभूतम् *labdha-parirakṣaṇa hetubhūtam*, which becomes the means of conservation of what has been obtained, बहिर्वेदिदान *bahirvedo-dāna*, giving of alms elsewhere than the altar ; तद्भागारामनिर्माणं *tad-bhāgarāmanirṇāṇam*, the making of a pool or a garden or the like ; पूर्तम् *pūrtam*, auspicious, कर्म *karma*, acts, लक्ष्यते *lakṣyate*, is denoted ; तदुभयम् *tad-ubhayaṁ*, both those ; पैतृकम् *pitṛikam*, appertaining to the father ; अपि *api*, though ; पितृद्रव्यविरोधार्जितम् *pitṛi-dravaṇa-virodhārjitaṁ*, accomplished at the charge of the patrimony ; अपि *api*, though ; अविभाज्यम् *avibhājyaṁ*, must not be distributed ; यथा *yathā*, as ; आहुः *āhuḥ*, declares ; लोकाक्षिः *lokaḥkṣiḥ*, *Loṇḍāḥkṣi* क्षेमम् *kṣemam*, *kṣemam* ; पूर्तम् *pūrtam*, conservatory ; योगम् *yogam*, *yoga* ; इष्टम् *iṣṭam*, sacrificial ; इति *iti*; so, आहुः *āhuḥ*, have named ; तत्त्वदर्शिनाः *tatva-darśinaḥ*, the learned, the philosophers, the knowers of truth ; अविभाज्ये *avibhājye*, indivisible ; च *cha*, and ; ते *te*, they both, प्रोक्ते *prokte*, are pronounced, शयनासनम् *śayanaśasnam*, bed and chair ; एव *eva*, also, च *cha*, and.

23. The term *yoga kṣema* is a conjunctive compound resolvable into *yoga* and *kṣema*. By the word *yoga* is signified a cause of obtaining something not already obtained : that is, a sacrificial act to be performed with fire, consecrated according to the Veda and the law. By the term *kṣema* is denoted an auspicious act which becomes the means of conservation of what has been obtained ; such as the making of a pool or a garden, or the giving of alms elsewhere than at the altar. Both these,

though appertaining to the father, or though accomplished at the charge of the patrimony are indivisible, as Laugalaṃ declares, "The learned, have named a conservatory act *kṣema* and a sacrificial one *yoga*, both are pronounced indivisible and so are the bed and the chair."

Balambhatta's gloss

23 'Kṣema'], the word 'kṣema' is non famous according to Amara (1426) It is a *dvandva* compound to indicate collection sacrificial acts ('stain') of that name digging of tank (jurtam) of that name, they are mentioned generally 'Appertaining to the father] by *aps*, the sucentral is also included he says generally by reason of its being understood also with the other not understood 'At the charge of the patrimony' under '*aps* (though) without detriment to the patrimony' is included There is an authority in support of the general proposition 'declares', by this the conclusion that in connection with the friendly gift, it is also a qualifying clause of it or it equally applies to it with a similar reasoning, is set aside by reason of its annulment generally

Medhātithi

योगक्षेमशब्देन योगक्षेमकारिणो राजमन्त्रिपुरोहितादयश्च्यन्ते इति केचित् ।
छत्रचामराद्यस्त्रोपानतप्रभृतयस्तस्ये । २४ ॥

योगक्षेमशब्देन *yogakṣema sabbdena*, by the word *yoga kṣema*, योगक्षेमकारिण *yogakṣema hārinah* those who effect sacrificial and conservatory acts, राजमन्त्रि पुरोहितादय *rājamantri purohitādayah* the king's counsellors, the stipendiary priests and the others; च्यन्ते *uchyante*, are meant इति *iti*, so, केचित् *kechit*, some छत्र-चामर शस्त्र उपानतप्रभृतय *chhatra chamara śastra upānat prabhṛitayah* parasols (umbrellas), cowtails, weapons shoes and similar things, च्यन्ते *uchyante*, are meant, इति *iti*, so, अन्ये *anye*, some others,

24. Some hold that by the compound term *yoga kṣema*, those who effect sacrificial and conservatory acts, (*yoga* and *kṣema*) are intended, as the king's counsellors, the stipendiary priests, and the rest Others say, weapons, cowtails, parasols, shoes, and similar things, are meant.

Balambhatta's gloss

24 He now proceeds to give the opinion of Medhātithi and Kal

patara; 'yoga'] ; he gives another view ; 'parasol']- According to all, the profit arising therefrom even if unequal should be divided Brihaspati says. "The profit arising to the possessor of 'yoga' and 'kṣema' is to be divided equally" ; by reason of possessing 'yoga' and 'kṣema.'

Mitākṣara

प्रचारोगृहारामादिषु प्रवेशनिर्गममार्गः सौख्यविभाज्यः । २५ ॥

प्रचारः prachārah, a common way, गृहारामादिषु grīhāramādiṣu, in houses and gardens, and other places ; प्रवेशनिर्गममार्गः praveśa-nirgama-mārgaḥ, road of ingress and egress ; सः saḥ, that ; अपि api, also ; अविभाज्यः avibhājyaḥ, not to be divided.

25. The common way, or road of ingress and egress to and from the house, garden, or the like, is also indivisible.

Bālabhāṭṭa's gloss

25. He says that in the word 'common way', there is ण् affix in the sense of instrumentality under 'And after consonants' (P. III. 3. 121)*

'House'] ; having stated the indivisibility of the road of ingress and egress from the house, garden or the like, it follows that the house, garden or the like are divisible, but he condemns it as being contrary to other smṛitis.

Mitākṣara.

यत्सुखतया क्षेत्रस्याविभाज्यत्वमुक्तम् । अविभाज्यं सगोत्राणां मासहस्रकुलादपि । याज्यं क्षेत्रं च पत्रं च कृताप्रमुदकं क्षिपति तद्ब्राह्मणोत्पन्नक्षत्रियादिपुत्रविषयम् । न प्रतिग्रहमूर्द्धया क्षत्रियादिसुताय वै । यच्चयेर्वापिता दद्यान्मृते विप्रसुतो हरेदिति स्मरणात् २६ ॥

यत् yat, which, as ; तु tu, but ; सुखतया sūkhātayā, by Uśānāsī ; क्षेत्रस्य kṣetrasya, of a field ; अविभाज्यत्वम् avibhājyātvam, exclusion from partition ; उक्तम् uktam, is stated ; अविभाज्यम् avibhājyam, not to be distributed ; सगोत्राणाम् sagotṛāṇām, among kinsmen ; मासहस्रकुलः śaśa-hra-kulād, to the thousand degrees ; अपि api, even ; याज्यम् yājyam, sacrificial gains ; पत्रम् kṣātram, land ; पत्रम् patram, written document ; or vehicles ; कृतप्रभम् kṛtāṇnam, prepared food ; उदकम् udakam, water ; क्षत्रिः śtriyaḥ, women ; इति iti, so, तद् tad, that ; ब्राह्मणोत्पन्नं brāhmaṇo-

utpanna, born of a Brahmana father ; क्षत्रियादि kṣatriyādi, by women of the kṣatriya (the military) and other inferior classes ; पुत्रविषयम् putra viṣayam, in reference to the sons ; न na, not ; प्रतिग्रहाद् prati-grahāḥ, land obtained by acceptance ; देयाḥ dēyāḥ, is to be given ; क्षत्रियादिसुताय kṣatriyādi-sūtāya, to a son born of a kṣatriya or other inferior wife ; वै vai, surely ; यद्यपि yadyapi, even, though ; एषाम् eṣām, to these, or their ; पिता pitā, father ; दायाद् dadyāt, would give ; मृते mṛito, after he (the father) is dead ; विप्रसुतः vipra-sutaḥ, the son of a Brāhmanī ; हरेत् haret, should take away ; इति iti, thus ; स्मरणाद् smaranaḥ, because it is ordained.

26. The exclusion of land from partition, as stated by Usanas, ('Sacrificial gains, land, written documents, prepared food, water, and women, are indivisible among kinsmen even to the thousandth degree ; ') bears reference to sons of Brahmana by women of the military and other inferior tribes : for it is ordained (by Vrihaspati) "Land, obtained by acceptance of donation, must not be given to the son of a kṣatriya or other wife of inferior tribe : even though his father give it to him, the son of the Brahmani may resume it, when his father is dead. "

Balambhatta's gloss.

26. 'As'] Vyāsa also follows the same order ; Prajāpati also says that 'sites of the house can not be divided' By this, the discussion in the above said four has been shown ; he sets it aside, 'that' here, 'and the other' includes a vaiśya tribe only but not a śūdra as will be shown later on. 'He cites from Brihaspati ; 'na prāti', the result of the qualifying clause will appear later on ; this by reason of the inherent power of the word relates to the partition made at the option of the father. Therefore in all partitions made at the instance of the sons in the paternal property, its absence is self-evident. He states about the ancestral property, 'here land' therefore, means all landed property and includes agricultural land (holding) by reason of using 'land' only and making a distinction between a gift of a house and that of land ; here ancestral house is not meant. Brihaspati therefore, says, "He who is a son of a woman of a Brahman caste shall inherit the land given as a Brahmana donation, but all who are twice born are entitled to succeed to the house property and the ancestral holding." 'Brahmana donation' means gift. So the original text of Madana Pārjāta stated previously should be considered improper. It may be said that even by not reconciling the conflict with Vyāsa, the conflict with Prajāpati remains intact by reason of the special prohibition as regards the self-acquired house property

other than obtained by charitable gift, in pursuance of the text of Bṛhaspati, in pursuance of the text of Prajapati in the text of Manu, the terms 'yoga and kṣema' have been probably explained by Medhātithi as meaning house site, but that refers to a case where it is without the consent of the father. So—

'In the house property and agricultural land (holding) the grand sons and the father are equally entitled, but in the paternal ones the sons have no right to demand partition without the consent of the father.' Vyāsa The statement of Kalpataru to the effect that 'kṣetra (holding) always means house site', is erroneous. Kātyāyana, therefore, says, 'let the existing house, land and quadrupeds be distributed.' By the difference between them the separation is made; it should be understood that even in the text of Vyāsa it is made.

Mitākṣ.

याज्यं याजनकर्म लब्धम् ॥ २७ ॥

याज्यम् yājyam, sacrificial gains; याजनकर्मलब्धम् yājana karma-labdham, acquired by officiating at religious ceremonies.

27. Sacrificial gains] acquired by officiating at religious ceremonies.

Balamhalla's gloss

27. While describing what is exempt from partition, he explains the secondary sense of the word the 'sacrificial gains' used; religious ceremonies']

Mitākṣ.

पितृप्रसादलब्धस्याधिभाजत्वं वक्ष्यते । नियमातिक्रमस्याधिभाज्यत्वमनन्तरमेव निरासि ॥ २८ ॥

पितृप्रसादलब्धस्य pītri-prasāda-labdhasya, of what is obtained through the fathers' favour, अधिभाज्यत्वं vibhājyatvam, exemption from partition; वक्ष्यते vākṣyate, will be subsequently declared; नियमातिक्रमस्य niyamāti-kramasya, of anything acquired by transgressing restrictions regarding the mode of acquisition, अधिभाज्यत्वं vibhājyatvam, the supposition of indivisibility, अनन्तरम् anantaram, already, एव eva, indeed, just; निरासि nirāsi, is pointed

28. What is obtained through the father's favour, will be subsequently declared exempt from partition. The supposition,

that any thing, acquired by transgressing restrictions regarding the mode of acquisition, is indivisible, has been already refuted.

Bālabhāṭṭa's gloss

28 When the original text writer commenced exempting from partition by saying 'without detriment to the patrimony,' he did not mention all assets, in order to remove this defect in the course of 'partition' he came to remember that which follows 'Through the father's favour', means that also, the original text writer says by the parents etc 'first Nārada-text has also laid down the same thing, it must be understood as pertaining to the partition at the instance of the sons Here the impartibility (exemption from partition), has been explained by the commentator by positive and negative precepts The positive rule consists in describing the nature of impartibility and the negative rule (prohibition) consists in the refutation of partitionability In this state, though said here, yet useful in the following, he comes to remember it 'Restriction'] means, for a Brahmana of acceptance of gift etc, 'already' means, the objection that arose in the discussion of the partible property by the propounder of the established truth, 'refuted' prohibited.

Mikera

पितृद्रव्यविरोधेन यदर्जितं तद्विभजनीयमिति स्थितं तत्रार्जकस्य भागद्वयवसिष्ठ-
वचनात् । येन येषां स्वयमुपार्जितं स्यादसद्वयं शमेयं लभेतेति ॥ २६ ।

पितृ द्रव्य विरोधेन pitṛidraṇya virodhena, at the expense of the patri-
mony, यद् यद्, what, कर्जितम् arjitaṁ, is acquired तद् tad, that विभजनीयम्
vibhajaniyam, is to be divided इति ita so स्थितम् sthitaṁ, is settled,
तत्र tatra, in such a case, अर्जकस्य arjakasya of the acquirer, भागद्वयम्
bhāgadvayam, is a pair of shares, वसिष्ठवचनम् vasiṣṭha-vachanāt, from
the passage of Vasiṣṭha, येन yena, by whom यच्चा अर्ज, येषां eṣāṁ, of
these, स्वयम् svayam, by himself, उपार्जितम् uparjitaṁ acquired स्यात्
syāt, would be, द्वयम् dvayam, two parts, a double share एव
eva, indeed, लभेत् labheta, would obtain इति ita so

29 It is settled, that whatever is acquired at the charge of the patrimony, is subject to partition. But the acquirer shall, in such a case, have a double share, by the text of Vasiṣṭha, "He, among them, who has made an acquisition, may take a double portion of it"

Bālabhāṭṭa's gloss

29 In such a state in order to have a bearing on the following, he

sums up the obvious result previously stated. - 'At the charge of the patrimony'] similarly and the rest in order to be in unison with the general subject. "Iatra" (in such a case) similarly in the earning from the friendly gifts etc, he says the same; 'by whom'] 'among them' among brothers.

Mitākṣara

अस्यापवादमाह ।

सामान्यार्थं समुत्थाने विभागस्तु समः स्मृतः॥ ३० ॥

अस्य asya, its; अपवादं aprādām, exception; आह āha, propounds.

सामान्य-अर्थ-समुत्थाने sāmānya-artha-samutthāne, if the common stock, or wealth be improved; विभागः vibhāgaḥ, division; तु to, but; समः samah, equal, स्मृतः smṛtaḥ, is ordained.

30. The author propounds an exception to that maxim, "But, if the common stock be improved, an equal division is ordained."

Balambhalla's gloss.

॥'Of this'] of the double share as said by Vasiṣṭha, the explanation of the 'common stock.' (follows)

Mitākṣara

अविभक्तानां भ्रातॄणां सामान्यस्वार्थस्य कृषिवाणिज्यादिना संभूय समुत्थाने सम्यग्दर्शने केनचित्कृते समस्य विभागो नास्ति पितुर्द्वयम् ॥ ३१ ॥

अविभक्तानाम् avibhaktānām, among unseparated; भ्रातॄणाम् bhṛātṛīnām, brothers; सामान्यस्य sāmānyasya, of the common stock; अपरं arthasya, of the stock; कृषिवाणिज्यादिना kṛiṣa-vāṇijyādina, by means of agriculture, commerce, or similar occupations; संभूय sambhūya, together; समुत्थाने samutthāne, on improvement; सम्यग्दर्शने samyagdarśate; on a good augmentation; केनचित् kenachit, by some one; कृते kṛite, done, effected; समः samah, equal; एव eva, indeed; विभागः vibhāgaḥ, division; न na, there is not; अस्ति asti, of the acquirer; अस्ति drayam, a double share.

31. Among unseparated brethren, if the common stock be

improved or augmented by any one of them, through agriculture, commerce, or similar means, an equal distribution nevertheless takes place ; and a double share is not allotted to the acquirer.

Balambhatta's gloss

81. 'Among the unseparated brethren], 'in improving', its explanation, 'thoroughly'], there the reason is assigned 'agriculture' for this object, it is said over and above the restrictive rule ; he gives the rest : 'by any one of them,' among the brothers etc.

END OF SEC IV.

SECTION V.

Mitākṛā.

पित्र्ये द्रव्ये तु पुत्राणां विभागो दर्शितः । इदानीं पैतामहे पौत्राणां विभागे विशेषमाह ॥ १ ।

अनेक पित्रकाणां तु पितृतोभागकल्पना ॥ १२० ॥

पित्र्ये pitrye, of the paternal, द्रव्ये dravye, estate ; तु in, but, पुत्राणाम् putrāṇām, among sons ; विभाग. vibhāgaḥ, distribution, दर्शित darśitah, is shown ; इदानीम् idānīm, now ; पैतामहे pitāmāhe, concerning grand father's estate, पौत्राणाम् pautrāṇām, among grandsons, विभागे vibhāge, in the matter of distribution, विशेषम् viśeṣam, a special rule ; आह Aha, propounds ; अनेकपित्रकाणाम् aneka pitrikāṇām, among grandsons by different fathers, तु in, but, पितृतः pitritah ; according to the fathers ; भागकल्पना bhāgkalpanā, the allotment of shares

1. The distribution of the paternal estate among sons has been shown ; the author next propounds a special rule concerning the division of the grandfather's effects by grandsons ;

"Among grandsons by different fathers, the allotment of shares is according to the fathers."

Balambhatta's gloss

1 He explains the relevancy of the succeeding. 'Paternal estate' means somehow his own property only; 'among sons' among them only; similarly in the following; 'of the grandfather's estate' in his only; 'concerning the division' means by reason of the accrual of the proprietary right by birth alone. 'By different fathers' i. e. the sons belonging to the different fathers, or the sons of different fathers; the meaning is that the grandfather is one who has got many sons related to each other as brothers; the sons of the latter are therefore sons of different fathers. The different reading is 'whose fathers are dead', 'the sons by different fathers' is an incorrect reading.

Mitākṣarā

यद्यपि पैतामहे द्रव्ये पैतामां जन्मना स्वत्वं पुत्रैरविशिष्टं तथापि तेषां पितृ-
हारेणैव पैतामहद्रव्ये विभागकल्पना । न स्वरूपापेक्षया । एतदुक्तं भवति । विभक्ता-
न्नातरः पुत्रानुत्पाद्य दिष्टं गतास्वदैकस्य द्वे पुत्रावप्यस्य त्रयोऽपरस्य चत्वार इति पुत्राणां
त्रैयस्ये तत्र द्वावेकं स्वपितृयमंशं लभते । अन्ये त्रयोऽप्येकमंशं पित्र्यं चत्वारोप्येकमंशं
पित्र्यं लभन्त इति । तथा केचुचित्पुत्रेऽपुत्रियमाणेषु केचुचित्पुत्रानुत्पाद्य विभजेष्वप्यमेव
न्यायोऽभियमाणाः स्वांशमेव लभन्ते । नष्टानामपि पुत्राः पित्र्यानेपांशान् लभन्त इति
घाचनिकी व्यवस्था ॥ १२० ॥

यद्यपि yadyapi, although, पैतामहे paitāmahe, over the grandfather's ;
द्रव्ये dravya, property ; पैतामां paitāma, of the grandsons ; जन्मना
janmanā, by birth ; स्वत्वं svatvam, proprietary right ; पुत्रैः putraiḥ,
with the sons ; अविशिष्टम् avīṣṭam, common ; तथापि tathāpi, still ; तेषां
teṣāṃ, their ; पितृहारेण pitṛ-dhāreṇa, through the father, एव eva, only ;
पैतामहे द्रव्ये paitāmahe-dravya, in the grandfather's property ; विभागकल्पना
vibhāga kalpanā, allotment of shares, न na, not ; स्वरूपापेक्षया svarūpa-
pekṣayā, with reference to themselves ; एतद्, etad, this, उक्तम् uktam,
expressed, भवति bhavati, is ; विभक्ता vibhaktāḥ, separated, अतर
bhātarāḥ, brothers, पुत्रान् putrān, sons, male issue, उतात् utpādy,
producing, दिष्ट-गताः diṣṭa-gatāḥ, die, तद् tadā, then ; एकस्य ekasya,
of one, द्वौ dvau, two ; पुत्रौ putrau, sons ; अपर anyasya, of the other ;
त्रयः trayāḥ, three, पुत्राः putrāḥ, sons, अपरः aparasya, of another one ;
चत्वारः chatvārāḥ, four ; इति iti, so, thus ; पुत्रानामुपेक्षया putrāṇāṃ vāikṣayā,
in case there is an inequality of sons ; तत्र tatra, there, in that case ; द्वौ
dvau, two ; एकम् ekam, one, whole only. स्वपितृयम् svapitṛyam, of their

own father, अंशम् aṁsam, share, लभते labhete, obtain, अन्ये anya, other, त्रयं trayah, three, अपि api, also, एकम् ekam, one अंशम् aṁsam, share, पित्र्यम् pitryam, the father's, चत्वार chatvārah, the four, अपि api, also, एकम् ekam, one, अंशम् aṁsam, share, पित्र्यम् pitryam father's, लभन्ते labhante, obtain, इति iti, so तथा tathā, similarly, केचिन् keśu chit, some, पुत्रेषु putreṣu, sons ध्रियमानेषु dhriyamāneṣu if they be living, केचिन् keśu chit, some, पुत्रान् putran, sons, उत्पाय ut, āiya, producing, विनष्टेषु vinaṣṭeṣu, if they be dead, अयम् ayam, this एव eva, indeed, न्याय nyāyah, rule, ध्रियमाना dhriyamānāḥ the living ones, स्वानाम् svānām, their own shares एव eva, only, लभन्ते labhante, obtain, नष्टानाम् naṣṭānām, of those that are dead, अपि api, even, पुत्रान् putrāḥ, sons, पित्र्यान् pitryān, paternal, एव eva, only, अंशम् aṁśām, shares, लभन्ते labhante, obtain, इति iti, thus, such, वाचनिकी vāchanikī, prescribed by the text, व्यवस्था vyavasthā, the adjustment

2. Although grandsons have by birth a right in the grandfather's estate, equally with sons, still the distribution of the grandfather's property must be adjusted through their father, and not with reference to themselves. The meaning here expressed is this if unseparated brothers die, leaving male issue, and the number of sons be unequal, one having two sons, another three, and a third four, the two receive a single share in right of their father, the other three take one share appertaining to their father, and the remaining four similarly obtain one share due to their father. So, if some of the sons be living and some have died leaving male issue; the same method should be observed the surviving sons take their own allotments, and the sons of their deceased brothers receive the shares of their own fathers respectively. Such is the adjustment prescribed by the text.

Balambhatta's gloss

2. He explains it fully along with objections, 'although' he says by reason of the ending in the instrumental case the affix *ataḥ* which applies in all declensions 'through their father only' 'only' is in the sense of 'but', the meaning is that the text is restrictive, he further gives the reverse (as contrast) 'not with reference to themselves' not per head (*per capita*) He gives the result, 'this' 'unseparated' is for distinction, 'there' among brothers. In order to remedy the defect, he applies the said principle elsewhere so, 'living', in existence or while alive, derived from *dhri* to remain, *Kātya*

yana has said so, "On the death of the unseparated son, his son is entitled to his share so that he may carry on his livelihood if he has not been provided for. He gets the share of his father from the uncle or his son a share to which other brothers are equitably and justly entitled 'or he gets it from his son so that there may be satisfaction' He says ; prescribed by the text' otherwise there will be meaninglessness, so it is a restrictive rule. This is the meaning

Kalpatauru thinks that it includes the sons begotten on one woman by many. Vishnu in the course of the explanation says "Of those who are of different fathers, the share is *per stirpes*, he gets the share of his father but not of any other "

Bṛhaspati therefore, says, " If the 'aurasa' and 'kṣetrāja' sons are the inheritors of one father, they get the share of the father but of no other "

Here the term 'kṣetrāja' does not mean the son as defined, since he is entitled to another share to be mentioned hereafter but every illegitimate son. "If two who are born from two fathers but one woman, claim the property, they get the property of their respective fathers but not of the other" Manu 9-191

Mitākṣarā

अधुनाविभक्ते पितर्यविद्यमानभ्रातृके वा पीत्रस्य पैतामहे द्रव्ये विभागोनास्ति अध्रियमाणे पितरि पितृतोभागकल्पनेत्युक्तत्वात् । भवतु वा स्वार्जितवत् पितुरिच्छयै-
वेत्याशङ्कितमाह

भूर्या पितामहोपात्ता नियन्धीद्रव्यमेव च ।

तत्र स्यात्सदृशं स्वाम्यं पितुः पुत्रस्य चैव हि ॥१२१॥

अधुना adhunā, now, विभक्ते vibhakte, if separate, पितरि pitari be the father अध्रियमाणे avidyamānabhṛātrike, if he has no brothers, वा vā, or, पीत्रस्य putrasya, of the grandson पैतामहे paithamahe, patiamahē, in the grand fathers', द्रव्ये dravye, wealth, विभागः vibhāgaḥ share, न na, not अस्ति asti, there is अध्रियमाणे adhrīyamāṇe, if he be deceased, पितरि pitari, if the father, पितुः pituḥ, through the father, in right of the father, भागकल्पना bhāga-kalpanā, the allotment of shares, इति it: so, प्रकृत्याṅ uktatvāt, it being directed; भवतु bhavatu, let it be वा vā or एवात्रिययद् svārtiyayad: like a distribution of his own acquisitions, पितुः pituḥ, of the father; इच्छया icchayā, according to the pleasure, एव eva, only, indeed, इति it, so, आशङ्कितं āśankitaḥ doubting, to obviate this doubt; आह āh the author says, अ, bhōh 'and, वा vā, which, पितामहोपात्ता pitamahopāttā,

acquired by the grand father निबन्ध निबन्धah, corrody, द्रव्यम् dravyam, chattels, एव eva, also, च cha, and, सन् tatra, in that, in all these स्यात् syāt, should be सद्रुतम् sadr ūtam, the same स्वाम्यम् svāmyam, ownership, पितुः pituh, of the father, पुत्रस्य putrasya of the son, च cha, and, एव eva, indeed, also, हि hi, for

¶ A rice field or other ground. A corrody. So many leaves receivable from a plantation of beetle pepper, or so many nuts from an orchard of areca, Chattel, Gold, silver, or other movables.

Balambhatta's gloss

8 From 'sons of different fathers' but not from other, it follows that a grandson gets the property through his father but not himself (per stirpe but not per capita). there too by reason of the right coming to an end on the death of the unseparated father on account of the non-creation of the right by partition and by reason of the obstruction of the proprietary right. So the right of the grandson is also like the obstructed heritage of the brothers, in this view what is said above is erroneous. Further in such a state, (e.g.) the father is alive and is separate from his father or by reason of being an only son of his father in the absence of other brothers lives with him unseparated. In the former case, by reason of being separate, he does not get a share because the father is separate and there is obstruction to inheritance by his existence, the grandson does not get a share in his grandfather's property. In the second case also, though his father gets the property by being undivided but he does not get it by reason of his existence. The result is that a grandson has never a share in the grand father's property while his father is alive. In order to reply to the objection, he gives the following passage, 'Now' the connection is, when the objection is raised, 'separate' is in contrast. The 'grandson' stands for ('includes') two grandsons many grandsons. In both cases he gives reasons, 'not in existence' means 'on death', if the reading is 'in existence' it is connected with the previous, in 'not father' is in the contrast, in his absence, he means that here in both cases, the father exists.

No, it is not proper because having said that the proprietary right accrues on birth, but does not depend on any other cause, the right to partition is proper in such a case, if that is so then prescribing the right to partition to accrue on the death of the father, it is well established that his right depends on him while he is alive. As the father appears to be principal, the partition depends on the will of the father. There he gets double share as in the self acquisitions, according to the text of Nārada the father's share is double. So he says 'or admitting' 'partition' comes as an ellipsis, 'but' is understood subsequently. 'According to the pleasure of the father', and according to the pleasure

of the father may be understood, there by 'iti' he gives it as suggesting an illustration in the case of 'bhavan' being the reading it is the unity of a sentence

Mitākṣarā.

भू शालित्तेत्रादिका । निबन्धनकस्य पर्णमारकस्येति पर्णानि । तथा एकस्य कमुकफलमारकस्येति कमुकफलानीत्याद्युक्तत्वाः । इव्य सुवर्णरजतादि । ४ ॥

भू 'bhāh, land, शालित्तेत्रादिका śālikṣetrādikā, a rice field or the like, निबन्धन nibandhan, corrod, (meour), एकस्य okasya, of one, पर्णमारकस्य parnabhā akasya of the plantation of a betle pepper, इत्येति ityanti, so many, पर्णानि parnani, leaves (to be received), तथा tathā, similarly, एकस्य okasya, of one, कमुकफल-मारकस्य kramuka phala bhārahasya, of an orchard of areca, इत्येति ityanti, so many, कमुकफलानि kramuka phalāni, areca nuts, इत्यादि ityadi, this and the like, उक्तलक्षणः ukta lakṣaṇaḥ, whose characteristics are spoken to be, इवम् dravyam, chattels, सुवर्ण-रज-तादि suvarṇa-rajata ādi, gold, silver and other movables

1 If the father, be alive, and separate from the grandfather, or if he have no brothers, a partition of the grandfather's estate with the grandson would not take place, since it has been directed, that shares shall be allotted, in right of the father, if he be deceased or, admitting partition, to take place, it would be made according to the pleasure of the father, like a distribution of his own acquisitions - to obviate this doubt the author says "For the ownership of the father and the son is the same in land, which was acquired by the grandfather, or in a corrod, or in chattels (which belonged to him)

Balambhatta's gloss

1 He gives the accepted meaning by virtue of the inherent power of the words 'rice field', and other, barley hold in order to distinguish it from the building site etc the subject relating to the building site will be made clear later on. Whatever is fixed by counting of leaves etc is corrod which is a means of livelihood royal grant of mines receivable permanently, he gives its description 'Of one', where there is a collection of leaves it is a compound word similarly in the following one that there are as many betel leaves or betel nuts in a particular betel grove or a betel nut grove is known to an expert therein but to no other by the approximate counting or ascertaining

thereof, it is fixed. Whatever is so fixed by the grandfather, in order to show connection with the following, he says

Middhāra

यत्पितामहेन प्रतिग्रहविजयादिना सत्यं तत्र पितुः पुत्रस्य च स्वांशे लोकप्रसिद्धमिति कृत्वा विभागऽस्ति । द्वियस्मात्तत्सदृशं समानम् । तस्माच्च पितुर्गिच्छयैव विभागो नापि पितुर्भागद्वयम् । ५ ॥

यत् Yat, which, पितामहेन pitāmahena, by the grand father प्रतिग्रह-विजयादिना pratigraha vijayā adinā & by means of acceptance & conquest or through similar channels, सत्यम् labdham, acquired सन्नातम् in such property, पितुः pituh, of the father पुत्रस्य putrasya, of the son च cha, and, स्वाम्यम् svamyam, the ownership, लोकप्रसिद्धं loka prasiddham is notorious, इति iti, so, कृत्वा kṛtvā, thinking, doing विभागं vibhagaḥ, partition, अस्ति asti, there is, द्वि hi, for (means) यस्मात् yasmāt, since, तत् tat, that right, सद्रूपम् śādrūpam, equal (means) समानम् samānam, alike तस्मात् tasnāt, therefore, ना ना, not, neither पितुः pituh, of the father इच्छया icchayā, according to the pleasure एव eva, indeed, विभागं vibhagaḥ, partition, न अपि na api, nor, not also, पितुः pituh, the father's भागद्वयं bhāgadvayaḥ a double share

5. In such property, which was acquired by the paternal grandfather, through acceptance of gift, or in conquest or other means, (as commerce, agriculture or service,) the ownership of father and son is notorious and therefore partition does take place. For, or because, the right is equal, or alike, therefore, partition is not restricted to be made by the father's choice nor has he a double share.

Bhambhātta's gloss

5 'Whatever by the grand father' he now says over and above the rules, 'through acceptance' 'and other', acceptance of income from commerce and service of the twice born. After setting forth the three things under the first half of the stanza he now fully explains the remaining half with the split of a sentence and filling up the ellipsis, 'there', in all the three, he gives the meaning as previously, 'does take place' being connected with the preceding passage means 'has a right'. In order to be in conformity with the reading and of both according to Lalpatara etc, he says 'for or because', 'equal' equal only by reason of

the connection with the following, he says the rest like the preceding; therefore 'there is no partition at the option', is a better reading; by this, the equal partition is suggested.

Rūhaspati also says. In the immovable and movable property acquired by the grand father, the son and the father have been declared to have equal right

Mītākṣarā

अतः पिदुतोभागकल्पनेत्येतस्त्वाम्ये समेऽपि वाचनिकम् । ६ ॥

अतः atah, hence; पिदुतः pitṛtub, according to the father's, भाग-कल्पना bhāga-kalpanā, the allotment of shares, इति iti, so, thus; एतत् etat, this (text) स्वाम्ये svāmye the right; समे same, equal; अपि api, even though; वाचनिकम् vāchanikam, text.

6. Hence also it is ordained by the preceding text, that "the allotment of shares shall be according to the father's" although the right be equal.

Balambhatta's gloss

6 In this state, to remove the fatuity which is shown by the first part and its contradiction, he strengthens the said scriptural quotation. [Hence], the meaning is because the equal proprietary right of the father and the son therein is well known, therefore.....ordained by the preceding text]. it is so ordained when the father is dead but not when he is alive, the reading 'of those whose father is dead' is, therefore, preferable; it is said previously also

Mītākṣarā

विभागं चेत्पिता कुर्यादित्येतस्याजितविषयं । तथा द्वावंशौ प्रतिपद्येत विमज्झा-
त्मनः पितेत्येतदपि स्याजितविषयं । जीवितोत्पत्त्यन्तः स्वाज्जरायापि समन्वित इत्ये-
तदपि पारतन्त्र्य मातापित्रजितद्रव्यविषयं । तथा अनीशास्तेहि जीवितोत्पत्त्येतदपि । ७ ॥

विभागम् vibhāgam, the partition, चेत् chet, if; पिता pitā, the father; कुर्यात् kuryāt, would do, इति एतत् iti etat, thus this, स्वाजितविषयम् swa-
arjita-viṣayam, is as regards the property acquired by the father him-
self, तथा tatā, so, द्वौ dya, two, अंशौ aṁśau, shares, प्रतिपद्येत prati-
padyeta, would reserve, विमज्झं vimajjan, making a partition; आत्मनः
ātmanah, for himself, पिता pitā, the father, इति-एतत् iti etat, thus, this;
अपि api, too, स्वाजितं विषयम् swa-arjita viṣayam, is such as regards the

distribution of his own acquisitions, जीवतो jivatoh, while both are living, अस्वतन्त्रः asvatantrah, not free, dependent, एवात् arāt, should be must be, जराया jarayā, by old age, अपि api even though समन्वितः samanvitah, accompanied by, arrived at (old age) इति-एतद् iti etad, thus this, अपि api, too, पारतन्त्र्यम् ;āratantryam, dependence, माता-पित्राजित द्रव्य-विषयम् mātā-pitrājita dravya viṣayam, must relate to effects acquired by the father or mother तथा tathā similarly, अनीक्ष अनिष्ठा, powerless, having no power, ते ti, they हि hi, for or truly जीवतो jivatoh, while both (the parents) are living, इति एतद् iti etad, thus, this, अपि api, too

7. The first text, "When the father makes a partition, "eto" (Sect 2 and 1) relates to property acquired by the father himself. So does that which ordains a double share "Let the father, making a partition, reserve two shares for himself" The dependence of sons, as affirmed in the following passage, "while both parents live, the control remains, even though they have arrived at old age, must relate to effects acquired by the father or mother. This other passage, "They have not power over it (the paternal estate) while their parents live" must be referred to the same subject

Balambhatta's gloss

7. He removes the contradiction from other text that arises from the second part "When the father makes a partition", it is also explained previously. He removes the contradiction that arises from the third part with the other text not explained previously, so] he cites Nārada, 'two shares', reservation is the taking or keeping in accordance with the rule. Of himself" it may be either 6th or 5th form of declension. The meaning is that this unequal partition happens by reason of the absence of any special customary law. Similarly the unequal partition under the text of Vasistha stated above should be understood. So it is established that the person earning shall get two shares in his self acquisitions in case of total partition. Same] he cites two views reconciling the conflict with other texts in this way while both parents live] the mother is also included. The result is the same as said as regards the ancestral property by reason of the original text pertaining to the paternal acquisitions

Mitākpara

तथा च सरजस्कायां मातरि सस्ये च पितरि विभागमनिच्छत्यपि पुत्रेच्छया

पैतामहद्रव्यविभागो भवति । ८ ॥

तथा tathâ, similarly ; च cha, and ; सरोजकायम् sarajaskâyam, being capable of producing more sons मातरि mâtari, mother ; सख्ये sakhya, retaining worldly affections, च cha and पितरि pitari, the father ; विभागम् vibhagam, partition, अविच्छिन्नि anichchhanti, not desisting ; अपि, though, अपिपुत्रेच्छया pitrechchayâ, at the pleasure of the sons, पैतामहद्रव्यविभागः patâmahadravya vibhagah, the partition of the grandfather's estate ; भवति bhavati, does take place.

8. Thus, while the mother is capable of bearing more sons, and the father retains his worldly affections and does not desire partition, a distribution of the grandfather's estate does nevertheless take place by the will of the son,

Balambhatta's gloss

8. He gives the special rule, 'thus' means when their proprietary right is equal. He gives the special rule arising from the absence of the three periods of partition during the lifetime of the father 'capable of bearing more sons', 'by even' (api), all the three reasons are joined together, by the will of the son', or it only, the will plays the principal part.

Mîdhgârâ.

तथा विभक्तेन पित्रा पैतामहे द्रव्ये दीयमाने विक्रीयमाणे वा पौत्रस्य निषेधेऽप्यधिकारः । पित्राजितेन न निषधाधिकारः । तत्परतन्त्रत्वात् । अनुमतिस्तु कर्तव्य ॥६॥

तथा tathâ, similarly, like-wise ; अविभक्तेन avibhaktena, by the unseparated ; पित्रा pitrâ, father, पैतामहे patâmahê, with the grandfather's द्रव्ये dravye estate, दीयमाने diyamâne, is being given, विक्रीयमाणे vikriyamâne, is being sold, वा vâ or, पौत्रस्य putrasya, of the grandson, the grandson has, निषेधे nishedhe, of prohibition, अपि api, also, अधिकारः adhikârah, the right, पित्राजिते pitrajite, if it be acquired by the father, तु tu, but, न na, no ; निषेध अधिकारः niş-dhâdhikârah, right of prohibition ; तत्परतन्त्रत्वात् tat-para-tantra trât, because he is dependent (the son) on him (the father) अनुमतिः anumatiḥ, acquiescence, तु, but कर्तव्य kartavya, must be made.

9. So likewise, the grandson has a right of prohibition if his unseparated father is making a donation, or a sale, of effects inherited from the grandfather : but he has no right of inter-

ference, if the effects were required by the father on the contrary, he must acquiesce, because he is dependent

Bhambhatta's gloss

9 He therefore, gives another special rule, 'so', similarly, by the unseparated' is in contradistinction because on separation the proprietary right being extinguished, there is no right to prohibit alienation by this the explanation by Medhātithi and others that the self-acquisition, are by means of learning and heroic exploits is reputed 'The last ancestral property recovered by the father with his ability and whatever is obtained by learning and heroic exploit is the property of the father', by *api* (even) the partition is also included, 'should be given' by the son.

Muddekarā

तथाहि । पैतृके पैतामहे च स्वार्थं यद्यपि जन्मनैव तथापि पैतृके पित्रिपद-
तन्त्रत्वात् पितुः स्वाजकत्वेन प्राधान्यात् विद्या विनियुज्यमाने स्वाजिते द्रव्ये पुन-
र्प्राप्तुमिति करिष्य । पैतामहे तु द्वयोः स्वाभ्यमविशिष्ट मिति निवेद्यविज्ञातोऽप्यस्तीति
विशेषः । १० ॥

kartavyā, must be made, *tathāpi*, consequently, *पैतृके* *paitṛike*, in the paternal, *पैतामहे* *paitāmahe*, in the grandfather, *च* *cha*, and, *स्वार्थम्* *svārtham*, right, *यद्यपि* *yadyapi*, although, *जन्मनैव* *janmanā*, by birth, *एव* *eva*, only, *तथापि* *tathāpi*, still yet *पैतृके* *paitṛike*, in the paternal, *पितृस्तत्त्वात्* *pitrī stautṛatvāt*, because of the dependance of one's father, *पितुः* *pitrōḥ*, the father's, *स्वाजकत्वेन* *svājakatven*, by right of his being the acquirer, *प्राधान्यात्* *prādhanyāt*, because of the predominance of (the father), *पित्रः* *pitrā*, by the father, *विनियुज्यमाने* *vinīyujyamāne*, while (the father), *विद्या* *vidyā*, is being disposed of, *स्वाजिते* *svājite*, acquired by himself, *द्रव्ये* *dravye*, the wealth, *पुनर्प्राप्तुमिति* *punarprāptum ity*, by the son, *प्राप्तुमिति* *prāptum ity*, *पैतामहे* *paitāmahe*, in the grandfather's, *kartavyā*, should be made, *पैतामहे* *paitāmahe*, there is the right; *तु* *tu*, but, *द्वयोः* *dvayoh*, of both, *स्वार्थम्* *svārtham*, there is the right; *इति* *iti*, hence, therefore, *निवेद्यविज्ञातः* *nivedyavijñātaḥ*, indiscriminately, *अपि* *api*, also, too, *अवि-
मिश्रहृद्भिराह* *avimishrahṛdbhirāha* the right of prohibition. *अपि* *api*, also, too, *अवि-
मिश्रहृद्भिराह* *avimishrahṛdbhirāha* the right of prohibition. *अपि* *api*, also, too, *अवि-
मिश्रहृद्भिराह* *avimishrahṛdbhirāha* the right of prohibition.

10 : Consequently the difficulty is this although he have a right by birth in his father's and in his grandfather's property; still, since he is dependent on his father in regard to the paternal estate, and since the father has a predominant interest as it was

acquired by himself, the son must acquiesce in the father's disposal of his own acquired property - but, since both have indiscriminately a right in the grandfather's estate, the son has a power of interdiction (if the father be dissipating the property)

Bālabhalla's gloss

10 He develops the last said with a reason, as for instance], by birth 'the same' is understood, father' of the son etc., here he says by reason of another' not earning anything - Both'] a mother has therefore no share in the ancestral property for want of proprietary right and authority. It should be understood that it is proper that the grandsons have unobstructed heritage as said previously

Mudhara

मनुष्यः । (अ ६ श्लो २०६) पैतृकं तु पिता द्रव्यमनयात् यदामुपात् । न तत्पुत्रैर्भजेत्सार्धमकामः स्वयमर्जितमिति । यत्पितामहार्जितं केनाप्यपहृतं पितामहेनानुभूतं यदि पितोद्धरति तत्स्वार्जितमिव पुत्रैः सार्धमकामः स्वयं न विभजेदिति यद्वन् वि

मनुः manuh, Manu, अपि api, too, पैतृकम् patrikam paternal, तु ta, but, पिता pitā, the father, द्रव्यम् dravyam, wealth, अनयात् anaya, tam, not recovered, यद् yad, which सोऽपुयात् so'apūyāt, would recover न na, not, तत् tat, 'that पुत्रैः putraih, (with) the sons; भजेत् bhajet, would divide, सार्धम् sārḍham, with, अकामः akāmah, if reluctant, स्वयम् svayam by himself, अर्जितम् arjitam acquired इति it, so this being the father, यत् yat, which, पितामहार्जितम्; pitāmaharjitam, acquired by the father and (ancestor), केनापि kena api by some one, अपहृतम् apahritam taken away, पितामहेन pitānāhena, by grandfather, अनुभूतम् anubhūtam, the ancestor the grandfather not redeemed यदि yadi, if पिता pita, the father, उद्धरति uddharati, recovers, तत् tat, that, स्वार्जितम् svarjitam, own acquisition, इव iva, like, पुत्रैः putraih, sons, सार्धम् sārḍham, with, अकामः akāmah not willing, स्वयम् svayam, himself, न na, not, विभजेत् vibhajet, should divide; इति it, so यद्वन् yadvan, saying, पितामहार्जितम् pitāmahārjitam the grandfathers' acquisition, अकामः akāmah not willing, अपि, even though, पुत्रेष्वाः putreṣvāḥ, at the pleasure of the sons पुत्रैः putraih, sons, सह saha with, विभजेत् vibhajet it, should divide, इति it, so दर्शयति darsayati, shows.